TRANSPLANTED TRUTHS
FROM ROMANS

A.S.HOBART

Class BS 2665
Book .H6
Copyright No.

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

TRANSPLANTED TRUTHS FROM ROMANS

TRANSPLANTED TRUTHS

Or, Expositions of Great Texts in Romans

BY

ALVAH SABIN HOBART, D. D.

Professor of New Testament Interpretation in Crozer Theological Seminary

Author of

"Tillage of the Heart," "Our Silent Partner," "Seed Thoughts for Right Living," "Transplanted Truths; or, Expositions of Great Texts in Ephesians," "Transplanted Truths; or, Expositions of Great Texts in Philippians and some Related Texts"

PHILADELPHIA

THE JUDSON PRESS

BOSTON CHICAGO ST. LOUIS NEW YORK
LOS ANGELES KANSAS CITY SEATTLE TORONTO

[1919]

B52665
.H6

Copyright, 1919, by
GILBERT N. BRINK, Secretary

Published March, 1919

APR -1 1919

©CI.A512868

PREFATORY WORD

THE former volumes, "Transplanted Truths" from Ephesians and from Philippians, have brought to me so many words of appreciation of their helpfulness that I do not feel the need of any word of explanation about this one. I have only to say that no one is more likely to notice the every-day style and the common-life illustrations that characterize it than the author. But it has been, not only in these books but in all my ministry, my constant aim to speak to the "common people." The "common people" heard the Great Preacher of Palestine gladly. It is to that audience I have tried to speak; tried to interpret the truths of the Book into the thought of these "common people." If some scholarly reader, interested in philosophy and higher theology, complains at the simplicity of this book this is my defense.

These chapters have been written to help the common preacher to become an expositor of the great epistle to the "common people."

A large part of the work was prepared for lectures at the summer school of the Kansas State Convention at Ottawa University in the spring of 1918. Owing to a disarrangement in the program, not all of the chapters were actually delivered, and those presented were in a greatly condensed and modified form.

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Introduction	ix
I.	The Gospel of God	1
II.	Every Man's Need of the Gospel	13
III.	Every Man's Supply	25
IV.	Justification	37
V.	The Results of Justification	45
VI.	The Great Compensation	58
VII.	The Dictionary of Faith	67
VIII.	Paul's "God Forbids"	78
IX.	The Gospel of God in Pantomime and Personification	92
X.	The Bridge from a Good Theology to a Better One	109
XI.	A Victorious Defeat	122
XII.	The Normal Work of the Holy Spirit in the Christian	134
XIII.	What About the Jews?	149
XIV.	The Christian Liturgy	161
XV.	The Christian and the State	173
XVI.	The Requirements of Christian Fellowship	185

INTRODUCTION

One of the essential things in the study of any book is to know something of the times and the purpose of the author. Another important element is the style of the author. In the study of this chapter we will try to get in touch with the situation and then examine for a little the style of the author.

We are told at the outset that it is written by Paul, "a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle—set apart to the gospel of God, which he promised beforehand through his prophets."

This man who thus tells us his official standing was a great-souled man. We read that when he was a young man he was a very zealous Jew. His family was one of more than common rank, for his father, a full-blooded Jew, had obtained citizenship in the Roman nation, and that cost much money and was allowed only to such as gave promise of being worth something to the Roman Government.

His early boyhood was spent in Tarsus, a city of Cilicia, and there he had opportunity to see the idolatrous world, and to test his own faith. He wrote of himself that as touching the ceremonial law he was blameless; which means that, as a boy, living in a city where to be a Jew was like being

a Protestant American in a Spanish or Austrian Roman Catholic city, when other boys were at play he kept the Sabbath; when other boys were profane he took not the name of God in vain; when others went to Roman shows, where men fought unto death, he went to the synagogue. He was not one of those Sunday School book boys who are "too proud to fight," and so good that they die early.

If the boy is father to the man we may be sure that Paul stood up like a man when others abused him.

Later he was sent away to Jerusalem to school. He went to Gamaliel, one of the great theologians of his time. It was like sending a boy now to some noted school where only the best can go; and there, as he says (Phil. 3 : 4-7), he was among the best scholars in Hebrew learning, and during all his course of study he did not slacken his zeal in religion.

Then when he was a man he came into prominence and was made a member of the Sanhedrin. That was the great Theological Court of the Jewish Church, and here he was a man full of zeal and determination, so that when Stephen was tried he voted to have him stoned to death, and when this was being done Paul was an official witness, and held the coats of those who pelted Stephen with stones until he died. And later still he went and begged the privilege of being made an ecclesiastical sheriff to hunt out women and children and drag

them to prison and to death that he might stamp out entirely the whole force of what he verily thought was sinful heresy.

But something happened to him. He was converted on his way to Damascus. All his views of Jesus changed, and from that time instead of being a persecutor he was a preacher of Christ, a servant of the Lord Jesus, as he calls himself.

But he did not become a mere non-persecutor. His conversion did not take out his manhood. That same devotion to principle and that same faith in God which made him the dangerous enemy to the church, were now simply transferred to a new cause, and he gave to that cause the same loyalty he had formerly given to the Jewish idea.

But since he was an apostle, a man sent out to tell the Gentile world about Christ, he took the people into his affections. After he had preached and established churches, he carried them in his heart. Daily he prayed for them, and gave thanks for them. He wrote them letters of instruction and comfort as occasions required.

The churches of Thessalonica and Galatia, Ephesus and Corinth, Philippi and Colosse had a place in his thought and care. This letter to Romans has a special quality different from the others in that it was written to a church he did not start, and with which he had no acquaintance. The tone of the letter shows us something of the recognition he already had among the churches. If he had been

just an ordinary disciple he would not have begun by saying, I am an apostle.

Again he says, I am coming to see you and I hope to have some fruit among you, and then to move on into Spain where no one has been before me, for I do not want to build on another man's foundation.

But the striking feature of the letter is that it is a doctrinal discussion of the central ideas of theology. It is a formal argument all the way through. There is no allusion to any prominent special errors at Rome; no case that needs discipline as at Corinth; no heretical teachers as among Galatian churches; no false teaching or undue anxiety about the return of Christ as at Thessalonica.

But he is setting forth in a systematic way the fundamental teachings of the Christian soteriology. It is impersonal and uncontroversial.

For this reason it has been the fountain of instructions in every century. Paul's writings were such that since his day no man has written or can write on the subject of theology with any degree of fulness without taking account of him.[1] One must either agree with him or refute his arguments. Paul was the founder of systematic theology. But he was not a dry theologian. His letters are alive, and warm with affection. It is said that the golden-mouthed preacher of Constantinople glowed with

[1] "The distinguishing doctrines of Christianity can be traced to the apostle Paul."—E. H. Johnson.

the great climaxes of Paul's argument. Augustine laid aside his dialectics to take up the profound philosophy of redemption found in this letter. Luther's electric batteries were charged with Paul's teaching about justification. Calvin was saturated with the great logical arguments of Paul.

Wherever the opinions of the church have been in formation, or wherever they have been brought into question, there Paul's arguments have been the standard of correctness.

One writer has gone so far as to say that Paul has eclipsed Jesus in the realm of theology; and others, as if they feared Paul's leadership, have said we must "get back to Christ."

THE ROMAN CHURCH

No historical record remains to tell us when or how the Church at Rome was started. It comes into history all at once. Paul says "to the church at Rome." Roman Catholics have claimed that Peter founded it. But there is no evidence except Catholic say-so, and that is worthless in such matters.

But it was there. It was evidently composed in part of Jewish converts, and in part of Gentile membership.

The letter does not attempt to separate them. But the argument deals with questions that the thoughtful would ask, whether they were Jew or

Gentile. It deals with the five fundamental religious facts of life—such things as all men must deal with:

First, The sense of God; secondly, The sense of deficiency in our life; thirdly, The divine way of relief; fourthly, Inward satisfaction; fifthly, Resultant duties.

Those five things must be considered by every man who thinks about life with any seriousness, and each one of these Paul discussed carefully. He had very definite views about each one, and he systematically dealt with them all.

One might study Romans around those five points, and one would find an almost complete body of doctrine.

Paul seems to have thought out the whole subject. He states his view; then he proves it; then points out its value; then replies to misconceptions or false inference; then states the duties growing out of it all.

HIS STYLE

In one of his letters he said, "I am all things to all men, only always under law to Christ." He met Gentiles on Gentile ground. He met the Jew on his ground. He did not sneer at others, but tried to lead them to better ground.

The modern doctrine of pedagogy that we must find a point of contact—mental and moral contact—and from that point lead minds out to better posi-

tions, he knew how to use, whether he formulated it or not.

He reasoned with the argumentative. He stirred the emotional by his outbursts of confidence. He upset the extremist by his "God forbids." He gratified the Jew by his habitual use of Old Testament writings.

But there is one very striking feature of his style that needs attention lest he be made into a mere peddler of logic, and that is his use of metaphors and similes.

In this connection we need to notice the law of metaphors. A metaphor is a term borrowed from one realm of things to convey an idea in another realm. Thus we say, "Ye are the salt of the earth." We mean that Christians have a function in the realm of the mind or of the spirit similar to the function of salt in the material world.

We say a man is a "pillar in the church." We mean that he does in a spiritual way what the pillar does in the material building.

We say Jesus is the Shepherd. We mean that the relation between the shepherd of sheep and his flock is like that which Jesus has to his people.

There is always a point of similarity between realms. A little girl said, "a parable is an earthly story with a heavenly meaning." That is, there is a kind of parallelism carried on in the mind between the "earthly story" and the "heavenly meaning."

In order to catch the meaning of a metaphor one must be familiar with the thing that is used as a metaphor, or he cannot get the meaning it is intended to convey.

For example, in one of my classes I asked what is the point of likeness in the metaphor, "Ye are the salt of the earth." Most of the men said, "Salt keeps meat from spoiling, and we must keep society from moral corruption." But another one said: "No. Salt makes things taste good, and we must make the world livable." When asked for his reason he said: "Jesus said, If the salt have lost its savor. That belongs to the realm of taste." And then he strengthened his argument by saying that they did not salt meat in that place, they dried it in the sun.

Now without settling that question we can all see that unless we understand the use of salt there we shall miss the Saviour's thought.

At another time we were discussing the meaning of leaven. I found several men who had no idea of leaven, or of bread-making. They were brought up in the city, and their mothers never baked a loaf of bread—they bought it at the baker's. So all they knew about leaven was that some one had told them it was a form of corruption, and a symbol of evil, and of course when Jesus said the kingdom of heaven was like leaven in a measure of meal they jumped to the conclusion that the church is going to evil. If they had found the basis of that metaphor they would have recalled how with a

little yeast stirred into a pan of flour and left to stand in a warm place overnight, the whole pan of meal will become—not a pan of yeast or of rotten flour, but a mass of light, promising dough ready to be baked into wholesome and delicious bread. Since the point of comparison is the transforming power of the Christian gospel, they would have seen the truth Jesus sought to convey. So we must always look for the basis of a metaphor.

Another fact about metaphors is that speakers pick up their metaphors from the mental atmosphere about them. Just now how full our speech is of expressions that come from the war: "Over the top," "over there," "service flags and stars," "keep your alignment," "keep step," "firing-line," "in the trenches," "at the front," "neutrals," "Allies," and many more words that are picked up and drafted into service, and made to do duty at the front of the battle-lines of the conflict of ideas.

Mr. Sunday is a most remarkable example of a man who picks his metaphors to suit his audience. In a parlor of some rich woman he speaks with beauty and elegance. He goes into the railroad shops and his tongue changes to the tongue of an expert railroad man. To the baseball men he talks about "bases," and "putting one over," and "foul balls," and "home runs," and "putting men out."

The only class of words he finds difficulty in being familiar with are theological terms—those he

has not mastered very well. But when you want to hear or read the only really accurate and satisfactory description of the saloon-keepers get Mr. Sunday's sermon on "Booze."

This choice of metaphors accounts for the great difference in the books of the New Testament. They are written with the words that the people were familiar with, and with the metaphors that were common among their readers. The writers had certain great ideas they wished to convey and they did just as we do. They picked out the metaphors and phrases that were familiar, and that carried the biggest load of meaning right to the mind and heart of the people.

This accounts for the fact that certain classes of metaphors are found in one book, and not found in others. Take the letter to the Philippians, for example. This has no reference to temple or sacrifice, to judge or king, to prophet or church or Scriptures. But it talks about fellowships and gospel and bonds and sufferings. It is full of expressions of his love for them. It exhorts to patience, but it argues nothing.

Peter writes to Jewish converts scattered abroad, away from their holy city and temple. They were believers in Christ, but they were in great perplexity because the glory they had expected to have had not come. Instead of having a country and a temple and a priesthood they were of the "dispersion"—the "scattered about"—so he says to them,

in metaphor big with meaning, "We are begotten unto a living hope"—not like your old one that has died out—"to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled that does not fade away"—as your earthly one has faded—"reserved in heaven"—not in Judea—"for those who are faithful." "Gird up your loins and wait for the grace that will come to you at the revelation of the Lord Jesus." You are to be "living stones," built into a "temple of the Lord." You are a "kingly race, a royal priesthood," "the very people of God." You see how all those metaphors would touch sympathetic chords, and convey understandable things to those Jewish people.

If we turn to Hebrews we come into the fragrance of the incense of the temple. Here we find "sin" and "sin offering," "altars," and "approaches," "great high priest," and days of "atonement," "veil of the temple," and "priesthood like that of Melchizedek." All the way through we are listening to religious talk in the religious dialect of Jewish Christians who were being taught that the temple and the ceremonies were shadows of things whose reality was now at hand.

If we go back to the Gospels we find Jesus says almost nothing about temple or sacrifices. God is not spoken of much as King, or Judge, or Avenger, but "Our Father in heaven." In the view of Jesus men are not subjects, nor soldiers, nor rulers, neither great ones nor small ones, but brethren.

The metaphors come from the family life, and the spirit is the family spirit.

I have dwelt upon this because I want to help you to see that Paul's metaphors are not to be taken as literal descriptions, or as doctrinal formulas. They are forms of expression suitable to those to whom he talked, and were chosen by the same principle that Mr. Sunday follows when he takes the words of the ballgame to tell the gospel to the ball-players. One must get into the heart of them or he will miss the teaching entirely.

ROME

Paul was writing to Romans at Rome. It was the great legal center for the wide-reaching dominions of the Empire. Roman minds had studied the problems of ruling over various races and classes, and had evolved a set of laws and a form of government that in many respects have been the model for the nations since then. English and American law is largely indebted to Rome. Courts and lawyers, criminals and crimes, law and pardon, guilt and innocence were all familiar words, and to Paul punishments and prisons were all too well known by experience. And so in writing to them he naturally uses the words and illustrations that are legal in character. When he spoke about sins and transgressions, about justifications and redemptions, about guilt and innocence, he was expressing the

thoughts common to all men in words common to Romans.

We may not expect, therefore, to find him dealing with exact theological formulas, which we are bound to accept and use, but he was putting his thought into forms understandable by them.

I would press this truth further. If we are bound to take metaphors in Romans as the formal exact expressions of the relations of men to God, why must we not take the metaphors in Hebrews in the same literal way? And, if we do, then we must say that there is a temple, and a priest, and a holy city, and tithes, and circumcision, and Gentiles outside the court. And when we come back to the Gospels we must drop these and think of ourselves as neither in Rome before the Judge, nor in Jerusalem at the gate of the temple, but in our Father's family, perhaps like "prodigal sons" returned for bread only, but finding forgiveness and a feast.

There are great spiritual values in these expressions, and as Doctor Bushnell said: "We cannot afford to lose them. They fill an office which nothing else can fill, and serve a use which cannot be served without them. . . We can do without them, it may be, for a little while, but after a time we seem to be in a gospel that has no atmosphere, and our breathing is in a gasping state. . . Our very prayers get introverted and muddled. . . We begin to sigh for some altar whither we may go and just see the fire burning and the smoke going

up on its own account, and circle about it with our believing hymns."

Making these allowances for the metaphorical uses we may find in Romans what becomes a framework for our thinking. But we may not assume that no other form of expression is good. What we want is to know the way of life, marked out in the way most understandable by us. But we shall try to study his letter as if we were in Rome, for in no other way can it do us any good. We shall try, through his words, to see the common idea, and to identify his thoughts with things in our own experience, and if possible transplant them into our thinking.

CHAPTER I

THE GOSPEL OF GOD

"Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, which he promised afore through his prophets in the holy Scriptures."—Romans 1 : 1, 2.

THE first impressions of people are often regulative of the later ones. Especially is this true of some very sensitive individuals. They cannot tell why, but they "feel," as if by a sort of extra sense, drawn or repelled by people on first acquaintance. Some salesmen say that much of their success in "selling" a new customer depends on the first impressions made in the first few minutes of their acquaintance. Military men say that in a large measure the victory of an onset is determined by the success of the first contact with the enemy. It is also true of books. The impression made by the introductory chapters determines whether one will read the rest or not.

This is true in part of the book of Romans. But it is not true that its favorable impressions are dependent wholly on the first impressions. A study of the arguments, and the defenses against error, and the rich expressions of truth have, in many

cases, overcome the impressions that men had when they first began to read this great letter.

But this first sentence grips the attention at once. Its grip tightens as we think about it. *"Set apart to the gospel of God."* This great-hearted, large-minded man consecrated to the "GOSPEL OF GOD"! This letter, written with great care and closely reasoned argument, thought out in great detail to meet the spiritual needs of the disciples of Christ Jesus in Rome—to tell them about the "GOSPEL OF GOD"! Surely the topic of it is attractive.

"Gospel"; let us examine this word a little. It has been called the equivalent of "good news," but that is not an accurate translation of it. The message of Paul was not "news." He says it is a message about things which God promised afore through his prophets in the holy Scriptures. And as he goes along with his letter he often quotes the Old Testament as proof of his conclusions, and declares that what he is now preaching is but the fulfilment of the Old Testament promises. It was not news in the sense of being fundamentally new to his readers. All its ethical principles had been known for centuries. The "man of God" as described in Genesis does not differ in essentials from the one drawn in Matthew. Abraham, transplanted to America, would command our respect. The Greek word is better represented by "good message" than by "good news." The angel that announced the birth of the child in the khan at Beth-

lehem said, "I bring you *good* tidings"—not "new" ones. The only element of newness was the fact that the long-looked-for had now arrived.

TRUTHS TO TRANSPLANT

The gospel of God is a "good message." Once in my early ministry we had been holding some special services hoping to lead men to accept the Saviour. At the close of one session I approached a man who had been there, saying I should be glad to help him to know the Christian faith. He replied, "Oh, I am going to take my medicine with the others." I said, "I do not quite catch your thought." "Oh," he answered, "I shall go to hell no doubt, but I am not going to whine about it." "But," I said, "I have not been trying to send you to hell. I want to help you to heaven." On further conversation I found that his idea of a minister's duty was to tell men they were on the way to hell; that the preacher's message is one of condemnation rather than one of reconciliation. They are not, in his view, set apart unto the *glad* message of God but unto a *sad* one.

There is a sad side to life, and sometimes the true friend must tell men that death and the judgment await those who persist in disobedience to God: that the judgment will at some time strip away all masks, and all deceptions from sin, and the souls will stand naked and alone before the

Judge who will sadly say, "I never knew you." Jesus had to say that, and he wept when he said it. But the main business of the minister is, like Paul's, to declare to men the *glad* message, not a *sad* one.

The gospel of God is a message of justification. No message can be of greater import and value than the one that tells us how to be right with God. The old statements of doctrine say, "The great gospel blessing is justification." Once have that, and the way is open for God to pour out upon us the riches of his gracious designs. Until we are set right with him, he cannot do for us what his love would prompt him to do. Note some of the joyful things growing out of the message of justification, good in any age:

"There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8 : 1).

"Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy" (Luke 2 : 10).

"Whosoever believeth on him shall not perish" (John 3 : 16).

"Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out" (John 6 : 37).

"He hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor. He hath sent me to proclaim release to captives, and the recovering of sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord" (Luke 4 : 18, 19).

"Every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened" (Matt. 7 : 8).

"Like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6 : 4).

"He will fashion anew the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of his glory" (Phil. 3 : 21).

"He who began a good work in you will continue it until the day of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1 : 6).

"I will come again and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also" (John 14 : 3).

"God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes; and death shall be no more; neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain, any more" (Rev. 21 : 4).

"Every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2 : 9-11).

These are the notes of the melody that runs through the Song of Redemption of which Paul's letter was one solo with his own variations. Paul, like the Psalmist before him, was no pessimist. He sang no song in the minor key. His word was "O taste and see that the Lord is good: blessed is the man that trusteth in him." (Ps. 34 : 8).

This is one great special feature of the gospel of God. Those who have it commend it to others.

Dr. Howard Furness, writing after a lengthy examination of spiritual mediums, said he found their claims a species of fraud imposed on an uncritical public; and that he wrote over the whole subject the sentence that Dante said was inscribed over Hades, "Abandon hope all ye who enter here."

Hume, the English philosopher, said to a friend, "You have no idea to what lonesomeness my philosophy has reduced me." The great scientist Charles Darwin said: "I sometimes feel that there may be in the universe a great being analogous to man back of all things; but then the feeling goes away, and I shall die an agnostic." Such are the consolations of the men who propound the solutions of life outside the gospel of God. But Paul rose above all such and lived in the sunlight of the upper air, above the mountains and above the clouds.

The gospel of God is an ancient message. Paul says it was preached afore through the prophets. In Galatians he wrote that it was preached beforehand unto Abraham. (Gal. 3 : 8.) In the earliest records it was stated that the promise was, In the "seed of Abraham" all nations shall be blessed. And Paul says that the "seed" to which reference was made was Christ Jesus.

And still earlier it was said, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." Vague as that statement was, it contained the seed of hope for the final victory of good over evil. The great Messianic oratorio of prophecy began, not, like

Handel's, with Isaiah's "Comfort ye my people," but with that far-off hint in Genesis of coming deliverance. Then the angel of Jehovah took up the message, "Thy seed shall be as the stars for multitude." Moses came in to say: "God will raise up unto you from among your brethren a prophet like unto me. Unto him shall ye harken." David spoke of him as one who should have "dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth." Isaiah said: "He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows," "by his stripes we are healed."

The angel sang at his birth, "Unto you is born this day a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord" (Luke 2 : 11). And now Paul is chosen from his birth to go and speak the GOSPEL OF GOD to all the nations.

It gives an element of value to learn that Paul was not giving a new theory of his own: not, like so-called Christian science, a philosophy concocted from the gathered fragments of worn-out and discarded schemes; nor was his message the sifted and refined residuum of truth that Greek or Roman religions may have contained. He was telling them of a glad message which originated with God and had been unfolding in history for centuries. Each singer in the great song of redemption had followed his own part of the music guided by the great leader, paying attention not to his fellow singers but the notes and the baton of his leader.

Kingdoms had arisen, flourished, and gone into oblivion since that song began. Assyria, Egypt, Babylon, ancient Greece, and the flower of Rome had all passed into forgotten history since the angel spoke to Abraham the message of salvation by faith. But the people who knew the joyful sound continued and still continue to be the greatest proof of the divine authorship of Paul's gospel.

Paul was not presenting himself as a soul-physician administering a man-made cure for sin, but he was administering a divine remedy under the directions of the Great Physician.

This gospel antedates the ceremonial law of Moses (Gal. 3 : 17), and it outlives it. The law came in for a season (Gal. 3 : 19) and went out when its work was done as flowers fall off when the fruit sets, or as shells break when the eaglets are hatched. (Heb. 8 : 13.) It will live when

> The stars grow cold,
> And the leaves of the judgment-book unfold.

The gospel of God is a Christ message. Christ, who was humanly born of the seed of David, by the holiness of his life and the fact of his resurrection, was declared to be the Son of God. The central purpose of the message is to present this Son to the world. Paul probably knew some of the philosophy of his times. He could not have lived in Tarsus as a boy, in Jerusalem as a theological student, and afterward preached in many cities be-

fore he wrote this letter, and not have become in a good measure informed about the thinking of the world. He knew well the ethical teachings of the Jewish prophets and the requirements of the ceremonial law; but he passed by all these—not as unimportant or as destitute of some truth—but that he might preach the Son of God. He wrote concerning his work in Corinth, "I determined to know nothing among you but Jesus Christ and him crucified." He wrote to the Galatians that he had set forth Jesus "evidently crucified." In his letters he says that Christ is the "propitiation for our sins," and that we are saved through "faith in his blood." He is "our Lord and Master." He is the "Head over all things to his church, which is his body." It is the purpose of God to "gather together in one all things in Christ."

Christ is the pattern man. "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ"; "Let that mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus." He is made unto us "wisdom and righteousness." Paul gloried in the Cross of Christ. He looked forward with anticipation to the return of Christ, and if he died before that event, he expected to depart and be with Christ, which was far better. And all is to be crowned by the resurrection and life with Christ. His gospel is Christocentric.

We of this day, when the ethical element is justly given an unusual emphasis, are in danger of separating the ethical element prominent in Jesus' teach-

ings from his person, and make that a sufficient requirement for our life and hope. This is not Pauline. He would not take the livery of Christ in which to serve the pride of his own heart. He followed the teachings of Jesus, but he depended on the help and inspiration from the person of Christ to give him ability to do so. If men asked him what they needed to do for salvation he replied, not "Correct your life," as the mere moralist says, nor "Turn over a new leaf," as some reformers say, nor "Quit your meanness," as Sam Jones used to say, nor "Right about face," as Mr. Moody used to say—all of which is right, but not sufficient; but "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you shall be saved." All those other things were involved in his reply as the rose is involved in the rosebud. Once in Him, and these follow. Paul had no message for men who were not "in Christ" except to urge them to get into him by faith. His gospel was the *gospel of the Son of God*. And the gladness of his message grew out of that fact.

We can well afford to magnify Christ and let our devotion and loyalty to him work out our deliverance from minor troubles about theology and ecclesiology.

The gospel of God is a world message. Paul says his commission was *"unto obedience of faith among all nations."* That is, he sought, and the purpose of his apostleship was to bring it to pass,

that people from among every nation should become obedient to God. But it is to be noticed that he does not say a fear-obedience, nor a ceremonial-obedience, nor a reasoned-out obedience, but a *faith-obedience*. That is, men would have obedience to the teachings of Jesus because they have such faith in him that his word becomes their law by a sort of spiritual instinct.

This idea is worth transplanting. One writer has said: "The highest life formed in us by the Spirit of God and directed to ends outside ourselves is, 'To do right because God requires it; to trust Christ because he deserves it; to love the brother whoever he is.'"[1] The first of these is no doubt a sound principle, but it is not the highest aim. Mr. Ruskin once said that if we keep on doing right we shall come to like doing so, and until we do we are in an immoral stage. Paul aimed at obedience growing out of faith in Christ. Those who have had experience in this kind of obedience are satisfied that his way is the best; that on any utilitarian basis Christ's way offers the best justification. But we are bound to follow it before that justification appears. But the great truth just now in mind is that the gospel of God is for all nations. Nothing is made more emphatic in Paul's life than the outbursting interest he had in all nations. His first call was to go unto the Gentiles (Acts 9 : 15),

[1] E. H. Johnson, in "Highest Life," p. 68.

and the last we hear of him he was seeking to get where no others had preceded him with the message. He would preach the unsearchable riches of Christ to the Gentiles. This feature of the letter should have our careful thought. The more one thinks about it the more certain he becomes that a message that is *not for all* is *not worth much for any*. If a man were to preach that he had a message from God suited only for the Anglo-Saxon race, it would be at once discredited. For God is one not two. He is not double-faced or two-sided. And he is God of Jews as well as of the Gentiles. Therefore the message of salvation from him must be for all mankind. This was the teaching of Jesus when he said: "Go, and disciple all nations; preach the gospel to every creature."

It follows, then, that until our own hearts have become interested in all men to the extent that according to our opportunities and abilities we are ready to give them the *gospel of God,* we are not in full harmony with the gospel itself. Our own hearts need attuning to the key in which the song of salvation has been written.

To gather up then the great ideas of this letter:
The *gospel of God* is a glad message.
It is a message of pardon.
It is an ancient message.
It is a Christ-centered message.
It is a message for the world.

CHAPTER II

EVERY MAN'S NEED OF THE GOSPEL

"That every mouth may be stopped."—Rom. 3 : 19.

In a former study it was shown that Paul puts his thought in systematic and logical form. His great proposition as stated in Chap. 1 : 16 is, "*The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.*" The way in which he goes on to discuss it shows that the emphasis in his thought is expressed by reading it, "The gospel is the *only* power of God for salvation to every one that believeth." That is, if men do not find salvation in that way they will not find it. He then proceeds to make them see the truth of his statement. His argument may be skeletonized as follows:

1. He assumes that men need salvation.

2. They must obtain it either by their own merit or in some other way.

3. Then he goes on to show that on the basis of personal merit they do not have any hope. This conclusion is stated in the text. Up to the twenty-first verse of Chapter 3 his whole aim is to show this to be the true situation.

I shall try to follow his line of thought carefully, and then consider some of the permanent ideas that

may be transplanted into our times and the field of our needs.

He says (1 : 18), "*The wrath of God is revealed against all unrighteousness of men who hinder the truth in unrighteousness.*" That is, those men who, because of their iniquities, suppress the true idea of living, are the objects of divine displeasure. Stated in the dialect of the courts of Rome, conceived of in the terms of government, all subjects have their peace and safety only when they keep the laws. If they violate them, or come short of them, they become at once automatically more or less the objects of governmental prosecution. Sooner or later they will come before the judge.

But he recognizes that there are three classes of people, each one of which classes, while admitting the justice of the principle he has declared, nevertheless by one reason or another seeks to excuse itself from the application of the law.

First, there is the mass of people in Rome, and in all the outside world, who might say of themselves—as many people now say about the same class—"These pagan people did not know, and therefore they are not condemned."

This view Paul squarely denies. For him the very conditions of the people bore testimony to the displeasure of the God of nature. They were not, as some men say, in a process of evolution toward a knowledge of God in which they slowly disentangled themselves from natural superstitions. He

thinks of it as the result of a process of devolution. With swift pen he describes their journey. They are not ignorant; "because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God manifested it unto them. For the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity; that they may be without excuse; because that, knowing God, they glorified him not as God, neither gave thanks; but became vain in their reasonings, and their senseless heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things."

It was for these things that "God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts unto uncleanness, that their bodies should be dishonoured among themselves; for that they exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. For this cause God gave them up unto vile passions; for their women changed the natural use into that which is against nature; and likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another, men with men working unseemliness, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was due."

And not only did their sins return physical ruin, but the whole mental and moral nature was corrupted and, "even as they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up unto a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not fitting; being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, hateful to God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, unmerciful; who, knowing the ordinance of God, that they which practise such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but also consent with them that practise them."

That record and those conditions were the continuous evidences—the loud-speaking witnesses—that the God of the world had attached sad consequences to ingratitude and neglect of him. His displeasure was not written on the skies, nor in the books of prophets; but men received in themselves, as they went along, the just recompense of their deeds; and these were the sure witnesses to divine displeasure: testimony that their conduct was against the constitution of things.

Then he addresses himself to another class, the moralists of the city. There were many of these. Seneca was one. Stoic philosophers abounded. Seneca's writings contain much that ranks with Christian teaching. Some have thought he had

some acquaintance with Paul. But Seneca, and his companions in morals, practised things that cannot be mentioned in public. To them Paul speaks: Since you say that knowledge of the divine way is necessary, all the more are you guilty, for "thou art without excuse, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest dost practise the same things. And we know that the judgment of God is according to truth against them that practise such things. And reckonest thou this, O man, who judgest them that practise such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? but after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up for thyself wrath in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his works; to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honour and incorruption, eternal life: but unto them that are factious and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek; but glory and honour and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek, for there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without

law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned under law shall be judged by law; for not the hearers of a law are just before God, but the doers of a law shall be justified; for when Gentiles, which have no law, do by nature the things of the law, these, having no law, are a law unto themselves; in that they shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them; in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ."

Then he writes to another class—to the ceremonialistic Jews—and says: "But if thou bearest the name of a Jew, and restest upon the law, and gloriest in God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are excellent, being instructed out of the law, and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them that are in darkness, a corrector of the foolish, a teacher of babes, having in the law the form of knowledge and of the truth; thou therefore that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou rob temples? thou who gloriest in the law, through thy transgression of the law dishonourest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you, even as it is written. For cir-

cumcision indeed profiteth, if thou be a doer of the law; but if thou be a transgressor of the law, thy circumcision is become uncircumcision. If therefore the uncircumcision keep the ordinances of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be reckoned for circumcision? and shall not the uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who with the letter and circumcision art a transgressor of the law? For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."

And then to drive home his charge he brings the testimony of the Jewish Scriptures against them. These prophets whose writings they were accustomed to read and respect, he says have told the same story about Jewish people.

"There is none righteous, no, not one;
There is none that understandeth,
There is none that seeketh after God;
They have all turned aside, they are together become unprofitable;
There is none that doeth good, no, not so much as one;
Their throat is an open sepulchre;
With their tongues they have used deceit:
The poison of asps is under their lips;

Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness:
Their feet are swift to shed blood:
Destruction and misery are in their ways:
And the way of peace have they not known:
There is no fear of God before their eyes."

It is evident then that on the basis of personal merit no one is justified. "Every mouth is stopped"; all have "come short," and hence all are under condemnation.

So far then we have followed his argument. Look back over it, and transpose it into modern key; what does it say to us?

We are all judged by the light we have within our reach. You noticed as you read the charge against the Roman common people that he said, "that which is known of God is *manifested in them,* so they are without excuse." The invisible qualities of God are manifest. Those Roman moralists were guilty in double degree because they claimed to know, but did not do; and so the Jewish people were superlatively guilty, because they had the light of nature and the light of philosophy crowned with the light of the God-given law. None was condemned without being guilty of "holding down the truth."

The *very essence of sin* is in the attitude of heart toward God. The vital principle of it—the poisonous root of all—is not some violation of a commandment, not the commission of some dishonorable act. It is not lying, or stealing, or swearing.

These are bad, but one may stop all these and not touch the root of evil. Dan Crawford, in his book, "Thinking Black," tells about a native who had been stealing. The penalty was to have the hand that stole cut off. But the negro said, "It was not my hand that stole, it was my heart." The essence of sin is in the attitude of heart toward God. See how the best teachers have shown this. David said, "Against thee and thee only have I sinned." When Jesus came he taught that he that hateth his brother is a murderer, and he that lusteth is an adulterer. So here Paul locates the trouble in the heart. Who "knowing God, did not glorify him as God, neither were thankful." Out of that root grew the things that blacken the chapter. The germinal evil is in that unthankful attitude. From that first step downward the course leads with increasing ease and speed to utter godlessness. It is not difficult to see how such an attitude contains the possibility of all wickedness. If one does not in his thinking exalt into the rightful superintendency of his life the Being that has created and keeps us—does not glorify him as *God* (and the word "God" is the symbol of goodness and authority)—then there is no responsibility to any one or anything outside oneself. That means that our fleshly desires and our human ambitions are the only regulators of our conduct. It is a short step from that to the worship of the creature, and the surrender of life to the strongest passions.

I am not saying that every man who is ungrateful is low and licentious; but I say that unless a man puts the authority of God over his life he has no chart, or compass, or safe pilot on board his ship. To *deny* the authority of God is *treason.* To refer all things to the *inner self* is practical *atheism.* General Grant, when he was lying on that dying bed at Mt. McGregor, with the dawn of the next world already appearing, wrote an article about his feelings concerning the war; and in it he wrote, "I am glad to live to see the North and the South united"—and then as he reread his page he crossed out the word "glad" and wrote over it the word "thankful." That was a great change. Thankful is a pregnant word. It implies the giver and the gift. No man can be "thankful" to a tree or to "Nature." Out of that word there shines the face of GOD, THE FATHER ALMIGHTY, and if there be no gratitude, there is no God glorified as God, and hence there is the root of all moral anarchy.

Our criticism of others is the measure of our responsibility. "Wherein thou judgest another thou condemnest thyself." "Reckonest thou this, O man who judgest them that practise such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?" There is in our country a very high idea of what the Christian church ought to be and to do. The whole community is instructed, and is correct in its judgment. It is a good condition to have. It makes great things possible. But

that high estimate is the standard by which the community must be judged. I have often wished that I could daily live as nobly and as kindly as the saloon-keepers say I ought to. I confess that I owe them considerable for the high demands they make upon me. But much as I owe them, their estimate of my duty will be a stone about their necks when they go into the waters of judgment unless they conform to it themselves. Our standard for others becomes God's standard for us.

Judged by these tests no man has a flawless record. Making all allowance for our necessary ignorances, it yet remains true that, judged by the holy law of God, or by the relations that we have to him, we all belong to the "shortcoming" class. We may struggle against our sins, but in vain. The lament of Paul is ours. "For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I know not: for not what I would, that do I practise; but what I hate, that I do. But if what I would not, that I do, I consent unto the law that it is good. So now it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me. For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me, but to do that which is good is not. For the good which I would I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I practise. But if what I would not, that I do, it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me. I find then the law, that to me who would do

good, evil is present. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then I myself with the mind serve the law of God: but with the flesh the law of sin." So that every excuse we might raise is vain. There is not a day of our life of which we can say, I will trust my future on the record of that day. It does not become us to assume an injured air and simply resent the accusation. It is not man's judgment of us. If it were, it would have little weight. Paul said: "It is a small thing that I be judged of you, or of man's judgment, yea, I judge not mine own self. For I know nothing against myself. Yet am I not hereby justified. But he that judgeth me is the Lord" (1 Cor. 4 : 3, 4). This judgment is passed upon us in view of the facts as our own consciousness must see them.

Every mouth is stopped, and on a legal basis all are guilty before God. No personal merit, and no inherited status, can avail. On the *basis of law* we are under condemnation. The consequences are being experienced now, and the final results, though delayed, are sure. If we go trusting to any merit of our own, we go out under the skies a company of guilt-laden men and women.

CHAPTER III

EVERY MAN'S SUPPLY

"Justified freely by his grace through the redemption."—Rom. 3 : 24.

After Paul has shown that on the basis of personal fulfilment of law every one comes short, and "every mouth is stopped," and "every one guilty before God," he comes in his imagination where he sees before him a world needing help, and finding none. But God—his God and the world's God—does not leave mankind to their fate. God's desire to have men right with him is far greater than any man's desire to be so. Men are estopped from complaint, because while they know, they fail to do. But God's mouth is not estopped from a word of counsel and hope for every man. During all the ages there has been a way to have the account settled between the man and his Maker. This way has been contained in the law-books of the Old Testament and in the writings of prophets. Romans were familiar with these. (See Acts 15 : 21.) And then, as if he saw that his readers were in an expectant frame of mind, waiting to hear more definitely what "way" was thus pointed to by the Scriptures, he continues, "justified freely by his

grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."

In that sentence is contained the soteriology of the New Testament crystallized. If we take any one of its several ideas, and trace its origin, and its purpose, and its effects, we shall find that it contains what accounts for all that is said about the various phases of the Christian life. Since this statement is a general one and not limited to Romans, we may consider it as if it were written directly to us. There are four elements. These let us examine separately.

"Justified." We are met here by two quite diverse views of what Paul meant. One view is that to be "justified" meant "to be made just." It is said that the phrase might be translated "being righteoused." That is, we are made good people "freely by his grace." The kindness of God so works upon us that we forsake our ingratitudes and our wrong-doings, and become grateful and obedient. This view makes "justification" to be a subjective improvement in life.[1]

The other view is that to be "justified" is not to have an improvement in our life, but in our relations to God. It amounts to our word "acquitted." The "justified" man is one whom the judge declares to have met the requirements of the law, so that now so far as the law is concerned he is guiltless. In explaining this men have gone beyond

[1] See Bushnell's "Vicarious Sacrifice."

the statement of Paul and have said that men are justified because Jesus bore the guilt and "penalty" of our sins, and therefore men are released from the law in the same way that they are released from a debt when another man pays it.

A not infrequent illustration of that view is the case of Mr. A, a drafted man, who has furnished a substitute, and the substitute has been killed. They say the draft law has no claims on Mr. A, for constructively he has died. He is legally dead. For myself, while admitting that these illustrations express some truth, I think that the more thoroughly one studies them the less will he be satisfied with them. It appears to me that the true interpretation lies neither in making men just, nor in substitution of Christ and the imputation of our guilt to him and of his death to us. I would state my own view like this:

Paul is writing to Romans whose common mode of thinking and speaking is in the terms of a court. Whatever idea he seeks to convey must be conveyed in language they would understand. The idea he was seeking to convey was that under a régime of law and personal merit men are all criminals. But, he says, there is a way whereby the relations to God of these criminals can be restored, and that is by faith in Christ. He does not attempt to explain, nor to philosophize how the death of Christ secures that end. His one aim is to get them to accept Christ: and he does not enter into

discussions about " imputation " of guilt or of righteousness. His thought is, " O ye who, when you estimate your personal merit, see and feel yourselves hopeless, know that your relations to your God can be so adjusted that you will stand acquitted." That must be our emphatic message when we try to reproduce his thought.

But while Paul does not discuss the philosophy of justification here, we find ourselves instinctively doing so, and it will not be extraneous if we consider that matter for a little here.

As I conceive it, the view of Doctor Bushnell, summarized above, fails to be in harmony with Paul's thought in this particular: Paul in his allusions to justification always speaks of something that has an immediate effect. When men have truly believed in Christ, something has been done that settles the past and opens the way for a new order of life. In the sixth chapter we get that idea. " We are buried with Christ by baptism into his death—that like as Christ was raised up from the dead . . . so we also should walk in newness of life." That is his explanation of the symbolism of baptism. It is not a gradual dying to the old relations that is symbolized, but an accomplished death. We do not bury people alive even though they are feeble. These people were conceived of as being dead to their old relations and therefore to be buried.[2]

[2] See also Rom. 5 : 1 and 8 : 1.

It is true that a real justification will open the way to a real transformation of character—that is, to an actual "righteousing"—but it seems to me that Paul's invariable conception of justification is that it is an accomplished transaction, not a progressive life. If we take Bushnell's view, we find that the facts of life contradict us; for the believers are still very far from being actually "righteoused."

On the other hand, I cannot see anything understandable or acceptable in the theory that my guilt and my penalty were placed upon Christ, or that Christ's holiness is imputed to me in any way that involves a substitution of his holiness for mine, or of his suffering for what was due to me. That view of the theory of atonement finds no foothold in my consciousness or my reason. Some years ago in a Southern State a very wicked negro was sentenced to be hung for murder. He had a very pious brother who was a preacher of the gospel. This brother wrote the governor, saying that his criminal brother, if hung, would lose his soul, but if he could be spared, he might become a good man, and he, the brother, therefore asked to be allowed to take his brother's place on the gallows, for he was a Christian and a saved man. Now if the governor had assented, he would not only have been without legal warrant for doing so, but public sentiment would have cried out against him as a murderer. There could not have been a transfer of guilt or penalty.

What would be ethically wrong among men cannot be right in God. I should be compelled to give up all my faith in Christian doctrine were it dependent on what to me is morally impossible. But my faith is not thus dependent. In my own thinking there is a kind of imputation, confirmed by every-day experience which is our heritage in Christ.

I knew an English workman in Cincinnati who by careful economy and constant industry kept a comfortable home. One day a young man from London came to him, bringing a letter from a former companion in the choir of the London church, saying, "This is my son, help him for my sake, and the sake of old times." He took the boy in to home and heart. He proved to be worthless and lazy. But that workman, hoping to save him, sheltered and fed the son for his father's sake. That is, he imputed to the son the character of his father. Within the halo of love that surrounded the father this young man seemed to be worthy. The father's worthiness became the son's worthiness by the imputation of association.

So I take it, one may, without violence to reason or experience, think of the worthiness of Christ as being a sort of overshadowing worthiness for all who by faith associate themselves with him. In that sense he becomes our righteousness, the halo about him glorifying us. He suffered for our benefit, but not in our place. He bore our sins in the

way he bore our sicknesses as recorded in Matthew 8 : 17. With this view I can see the meaning of all the passages that are really connected with the subject, although they may not directly discuss it.

And with such a view comes great comfort of soul. When one feels, as one must often feel, how unworthy he is, he thinks, "I do not stand alone, I am associated by faith with one whose worthiness overshadows me." And when one asks himself what the future may have in store for him, he does not begin to reckon up his own merits, but he thinks, "What the Father thinks of the Son, and what he will do for him, measures what he thinks of me and will do for me." And what Jesus has undertaken to do with me may be reckoned as already accomplished. So that potentially I am "made complete."

So without ethical violence we urge all to seek by faith to be so united to Christ that through this kind of imputation they may be now justified.[3]

"*Freely.*" We have a use of the word "freely" that conveys the meaning "abundantly." Probably this use comes from the fact that we usually take

[3] "Following the example of St. Paul, and St. John, and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews we speak of something in this great sacrifice as 'propitiation.' We believe the Holy Spirit spoke through these writers, and it was his will that we should use this word. But it is a word which we must leave it to him to interpret. We drop our plummet into the depth, but the line attached to it is too short, and it does not touch the bottom. The awful processes of the divine mind we cannot fathom. Sufficient for us to know that through the virtue of one sacrifice our sacrifices are accepted, the barrier which sin places between us and God is removed." (Sanday, "International Com. on Romans," p. 94.)

abundantly what we can get without cost. But the meaning here is not that. It is equivalent to "without cost." It is in the Greek "*dorean.*" We have the same word in Matthew 10 : 8, where Jesus tells his disciples as they go out to preach, "Freely ye have received, freely give." That is, this message I have given you costs you nothing, give it to others without cost. In another place (John 15 : 25) we read, "They hated me without a cause," that is, with nothing to justify it. Again we read in Acts 2 : 38, "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Under these and many other such there is one common idea, namely, that the thing given was given entirely without reference to any sort of compensating return either before or after the gift was made. I emphasize this because it is after all the very essential point in all Paul's argument, as it is in our day the most difficult to see correctly. The original source of the gift is stated to be the grace of God. Out of his own kind and loving heart there sprang "as acorn springs from oak" the way of life as Paul taught it. Or to use the phrase of Philip Doddridge:

> Grace first contrived the way
> To save rebellious man;
> And all the steps that grace display
> Which drew the wondrous plan.

It was necessary for this fact to be driven home by all and by every means because it was a time when

the idea of the opposite belief prevailed. In all the idolatrous world and in all the polytheistic world the notion held sway that the gods were to be propitiated in some way. Their favor was to be obtained by some sort of gift or some—what we in modern politics call—"pull" with the more powerful one. "All their rule was not one of justice or beneficence, but of caprice. Their favor was purchased by hecatombs,[4] and their hatred incurred by acts that had no moral quality that should give offense to an upright judge." If any one had in any way incurred the displeasure of the god or if he felt the need of something from the god, he must take some kind of gift to the god. There were no free passes. Homer relates in the Iliad how the priest of the god, Phœbus Apollo, went to the Greek chieftains to ask for his daughter who had been taken from him in war. He offered a large ransom, but was insolently refused. But after a quarrel among the chiefs, Agamemnon yielded and

> . . . bade upon the sea
> Launch a swift bark, with twenty chosen men
> To ply the oars, and put a hecatomb
> Upon it for the God.
>
> —Bryant, "*Iliad*," Bk. I, line 185.

At the end of the journey the offering was presented and the messengers said:

[4] Offerings of one hundred beasts.

> O, Chryses! Agamemnon king of men
> Sends me in haste to bring again this maid to thee,
> And offer up this hallowed hecatomb
> To Phœbus for the Greeks, that so the God
> Whose wrath afflicts us sore may be appeased.
>
> —*Ibid.*, line 550.

After the sacrifice and the feast they

> Sang to appease the God; they chanted forth
> High anthems to the Archer of the skies.
> He listened to the strains and his stern mood
> Was softened.
>
> —*Ibid.*, line 595.

That fairly represents the polytheistic thought of gods. Among the Hebrews that conception had a very strong hold. It is recorded that when Saul was in a hurry to go out to fight the Philistines he did not think it safe to go until he had "entreated the favor of Jehovah." He was so eager about it that he did not wait for the priest but made the offering himself. On this account the prophet told him that he had "done foolishly," and that his kingdom would not continue. (1 Sam. 13 : 13.) When Jonah was in the ship tossed in a storm, the sailors said to him: "What meanest thou, O sleeper? Arise and call upon thy God, if so be that he will think upon us and that we do not perish" (Jonah 1 : 6). In the Psalms provided for the temple worship we have expressions like the following:

"Who shall sojourn in thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that walketh up-

rightly and worketh righteously; . . . He that doeth these things shall never be moved" (Ps. 15 : 1-5).

"Their sorrows shall be multiplied that give gifts for another god. Their drink offerings will not I offer, nor take their names upon my lips" (Ps. 16 : 4).

"Bring an offering, and come into his courts" (Ps. 96 : 8).

"I was also perfect with him, and I kept myself from mine iniquity. Therefore hath Jehovah recompensed me according to my righteousness, according to the cleanness of my hands in his eyesight" (Ps. 18 : 23, 24).

"The Lord strengthen thee out of Zion; remember all thy offerings, and accept thy burnt sacrifices" (Ps. 20 : 2, 3).

"Blessed is he that considereth the poor. Jehovah will deliver him in the day of evil. He will preserve him, and keep him alive, and he shall be blessed upon the earth. Jehovah will support him upon the couch of languishing" (Ps. 41 : 1-3).

We are not to understand that this taint of polytheistic character dominates the Psalms; for it does not. But the traces of it are seen in them.

In the historical books of the Old Testament we have one continuous record of the struggle of the best men to shake off from the nation this notion that God is more to be served by men as a condition of his favor than men are to be blessed by him as a result of their unbounded faith in him.

As an example: "I have had enough of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts. I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this of your hands, to trample my courts? Bring no more vain oblations, incense is an abomination unto me" (Isa. 1 : 11-13).

Or note the words of Malachi: "A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name. And ye say, Wherein have we despised thy name? Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar. And ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say, The table of the Lord is contemptible. And when ye offer the blind for sacrifice, it is no evil! and when ye offer the lame and sick, it is no evil! Present it now unto thy governor; will he be pleased with thee? or will he accept thy person? saith the Lord of hosts. And now, I pray you, entreat the favour of God, that he may be gracious unto us: this hath been by your means: will he accept any of your persons? saith the Lord of hosts. Oh that there were one among you that would shut the doors, that ye might not kindle fire on mine altar in vain! I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand" (Mal. 1 : 6-10).

CHAPTER IV

JUSTIFICATION

In Paul's time the matter had been much refined. All connection with polytheistic religion was gone from Israel. And it does not appear that they considered God as a being of half pagan character, having sensuous qualities that must be ministered unto. He was a spiritual being, dwelling in all the heavens, and ruling over all the earth. But the idea possessed the leading teachers of the nation that the observing of ceremonial commands, and the performing of various acts of worship, all under the regulation of the ceremonial code, were necessary for Israel to retain the favor of God, as well as for Gentile peoples to come into the charmed circle of his favorites. To put it in the words of Paul, they considered that salvation was obtained by "works." And "works" meant things done to please God and to fill up certain essential requirements of holiness. The man who did these "works" abundantly had a better standing with God than the man who did them sparingly.

The idea of propitiating God by such things was much more refined than the idea of feeding the gods, but at the core there was a common error, namely, God gives his favor in return for things

done to him. There is a certain "*quid pro quo*" about it in both cases.

In a much more refined degree the same idea now is too common to make Paul's teaching unnecessary. We often hear people say, "I do not know what I have done to merit such misfortune." "I have served the church many years, and why should I now suffer?" "I have given my tenth, and yet I am in hard luck." "If you give a tenth you will be prospered." "The Lord loveth a cheerful giver." And the implication is, he does not love the other kind of givers. A common argument by Roman Catholics is: "Our religion is the truest because it is the hardest. It costs us more to be good Catholics than it does you to be good Protestants." Others say, "If I turn over a new leaf and begin to do what I ought, I will be all right." These and similar things all have the error that Paul combated tainting much that is otherwise good about them.

With this as a background, let us now see what Paul's idea is. He is not discussing the value of "works" as a part of the Christian life. He wrote to the Ephesians that they were "created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God had foreordained that they should walk in them" (Eph. 2 : 10).

He is talking about "justification"; that is, about how men who were sinful before God were to have their relations to him set right preparatory to having their living right. It was the same kind

of question that the prodigal must have asked before he returned to his father. "What," he thought, "shall I be required to do, or what shall I say to get my father's consent to work on the old farm again?" That is a very different question from the one he would ask after he was restored to his father's bosom and was at work on the old farm. Then it would be, "How can I gratefully serve so loving a father, who has so graciously forgiven me all my ingratitudes?" He was not restored for the sake of his good works, but he sought to do good works because he had been restored. His idea was, "I am not worthy to be called thy son, but if you will let me be a servant I will work for my board." His father freely forgave him and restored him. "Justified him freely by his grace."

The justification is not of works; it is free; but not so the sanctification. This latter costs effort and sacrifice and suffering perhaps. But justification is God's act on his own terms, and the terms are "freely by his grace."

Although the Jewish leaders in Paul's time were students of the Old Testament they blindly overlooked the greatest fact in those prophetic books of which they were so proud. "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money, and without price" (Isa. 55 : 1). "He will feed his flock like a shep-

herd, he will gather the lambs in his arms, and carry them in his bosom" (Isa. 40 : 11). "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want" (Ps. 23 : 1). These are but examples of hundreds of passages uttered during several centuries by prophets in succession having the central thought that Israel was the people of God because he chose them for his own. They were to obey him and love him, it is true, but the initiatory act was by him, and that initiation grew out of his grace, not out of their goodness. "Propitiation" cannot therefore mean to make him kindly disposed, for he "sent his Son" to save the world when in spirit and act the world was hostile.

And in these days it will not be thought irrelevant to glance at the world outside of the Bible. All the things of God are of grace; that is, they come to us without price. For example: How much rent does the farmer pay God for the use of the infinite forces of nature? He sows a little wheat, and at once earth and air spring to his service. While he sleeps they work for him. They perfect his crop. When it is ripe he harvests, grinds, and eats it.

How much does the gardener pay for the exquisite taste and tireless industry of the forces of chemistry and light that fashion and color and perfume the flowers that beautify his garden?

These astonishing activities of electricity, which are revolutionizing the commerce of the world—

how much rent to God do they pay who thus draft these forces as willing helpers for themselves?

Nay, how much do any of us pay to God for the life forces that make our hearts throb and our functions continue—for our life itself?

All these are freely given to us. We neither can, nor are we asked to pay for them.

> Earth gets its price for what Earth gives us;
> The beggar is taxed for a corner to die in,
> The priest has his fee who comes and shrives us,
> We bargain for the graves we lie in;
> At the devil's booth are all things sold,
> Each ounce of dross costs its ounce of gold;
> For a cap and bells our lives we pay,
> Bubbles we buy with a whole soul's tasking:
> 'Tis heaven alone that is given away,
> 'Tis only God may be had for the asking;
> No price is set on the lavish summer;
> June may be had by the poorest comer.
>
> —*Lowell.*

In matters of our relation to the one God all have the same conditions. As rain falls without cost, as sun shines on us gratis, so justification is freely given us out of the grace of God. No man has any more need to pray that God will be kind to him than he has to pray that God will let the sun shine in his windows. What he has need to do is to open the window. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish" (John 3 : 16). He is not to be made propitious;

he is propitious. He is not to be persuaded; we are to be persuaded. We are not to ransom ourselves; he has ransomed us.

"*Through the redemption.*" Two great ideas are compressed into this one word "redemption." The word itself is related closely to the slave-market. It brings to mind a kind man going into the mart for slaves and by exchange or purchase securing the liberty of some one held in bondage. The real emphasis is not on the method by which he secures the freedom but on the fact that he secures it. Both the onlooker and the slave himself, in the joy of the freedom attained, might not even remember how it was secured. It would not matter who had owned the slave, nor what he did with the money. So in this case it is not worth while to inquire to whom the "redemption" value was given, nor what became of it afterward. It is the freedom from condemnation that interests us. It is the "redemption" that Christ secured rather than the one from whom he secured it.

Paul has said that the justification is without cost to us, but not so to him that secured it. It is free to us through the redemption that he wrought.

The specific effect of that "act of redemption" in the divine economy no one knows. It has been discussed pro and con for nineteen centuries without settlement. But that it removed all that stood in the path of a free justification for us none deny. And without that "act of redemption" Paul

thought—and all who accept him still think—that no justification could be attained.

Christ Jesus was set forth—exhibited openly—before the world as the "propitiation" for our sins. He by his whole life from birth to ascension accomplished what was necessary to make the justification free *to us* although with great cost to himself.

The great majority of writers on the subject feel constrained to say that the death of Christ had a substitutionary character, that the blood—standing for the death—of Jesus was a vicarious penalty for the sins of the world. Their arguments have great weight. It is quite possible that Paul, who had been brought up with the sacrificial ideas always before him, had this conception or one that took that direction. There is, however, enough on the other side to give me confidence to say that I cannot find any basis in my own heart nor any sure ground in Paul's language on which to base that view. I am in this matter an agnostic.

I prefer to understand propitiation to mean the meeting-place for men and God. When men differ and fall out a reconciliation is brought about by meeting at the house of a friend. When nations war and then seek peace, conference is had on some intermediate or neutral ground.[1] So I think

[1] In 1807 a raft was anchored in the middle of the river Memel at Tilsit. Napoleon went out to it in a skiff from the south, and Alexander the Russian czar came to it from the north, and there the treaty of Tilsit was made and signed which united France and Russia against England.—(Poultney Bigelow, "German Struggle for Liberty," Vol. I, p. 92.)

the old sacrifices were not substitutionary. They were confessional. "A remembrance of sin" was made. They were consecrative in that they were the symbol of surrender. And in them God and the sinner met together to secure peace. So it seems to me the sinner comes to Christ, yields life and faith to him. God on the other side is "in Christ reconciling us to himself." Christ is therefore the "*hilasterion*"—the meeting-place—where we may be reconciled to God.

Thus we have the *Gospel of God* stated in Roman forms of speech: "Being justified freely by his grace, through. the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth to be a propitiation for our sins."

As at the outset of this chapter I said it is the gospel in crystal, so I repeat we have here what constitutes for the one who sincerely accepts it a whole body of Christian doctrine and a flowing fountain of Christian hope.

May all who read this come to possess it. Quite likely my explanation may not satisfy all. But it is not necessary to agree with me. The important thing is that men accept Christ as their leader, teacher, helper, redeemer, Saviour. He will fill for each what the real need now is, and will crown his work for them, we believe, by a glorious resurrection and an inheritance of eternal life beyond.

CHAPTER V

THE RESULTS OF JUSTIFICATION

"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us. For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly."—Rom. 5 : 1-6.

In central Vermont, when a farmer sees breaking out from the ledges of rock in his pasture white or whitish veins, he at once thinks of marble. It may be that his farm is but the covering of quarries that will make him rich. So he bores or blasts down into the earth to discover whether his conjectures are well founded. Some men have found fortunes thus lying in wait for the man who would discover them. When I see one of Paul's "therefores" I am reminded of such men. It tells me that under the word there lies a truth well worth studying for. It tells me that he has laid a train of thought preparatory to his word and that now the treasure is ready to be uncovered. Such

a case is here in this passage. Up to this point he has been stating the way of being justified. It is by faith in Christ. Now the sinner is conceived of as one whose account has been settled with the Judge. What follows from this settlement? Being justified by faith—that is having been justified—what are the results? He replies in the words of this passage. Let us examine it.

"*We have peace with God.*" We find two meanings ascribed to this by scholars of merit. One, as given in the Roman Catholic and in the Bible Union versions, makes it read "Let us have peace," as if it were an exhortation to be at peace.

This does not meet my view of the whole passage. It would not be consistent, after a man has been discharged by the judge, to say, "Now be at peace with him." The peace is already declared.

The other view makes it read—as in the King James and in the Standard versions—"We have peace with God"; and then Paul goes on to mention some of the results of that peace.

It is also to be noted that the peace he speaks of is the peace of relations to God, not the peace of heart that is meant by Paul in another place where he says, "The peace of God that passeth all understanding keep your hearts and minds" (Phil. 4 : 7). That kind of peace is ours to seek for, but it is not what is in his thought here. Rather is this the thought: Heretofore the sinner has been unwilling to do what his Creator and Father de-

sired him to do. In greater or less degree he was in a disobedient frame of mind. Technically he was a rebel at war with God. His life was an endeavor to go contrary to the current of God's plans for him. He was trying to row up the stream. But now he has swung into the current and moves with it unresistingly. Now his war is ended. He has accepted the way of God and walks in it. In that sense he is at peace with God. It is God's purpose that all men shall become followers of Jesus. To him every knee is to bow, and every tongue confess that he is Lord. Until one has done that, he is in an antagonistic attitude to God. When he has done that, he is at peace. Instead of being a company of those whom God is seeking to reconcile, Christian people are become a company of those who are reconciled to him and his way.

And how rich are the associations of that word "peace"! I remember how in '65 when our boys were away in the army the word came that the war was over. Lee had surrendered. Then, as if by common instinct, all the village went out into the street. The sextons rang the church-bells. The country people came hurrying into the village. The boys kindled a big bonfire. The village orators made speeches of rejoicing. Peace had come! If we should hear such a word now the whole world would be moved with gratitude and praise.[1]

[1] Since these words were written, all the world has been thrilled by the news of peace, and all the world has sung songs of praise.

While that is more outwardly expressive, it would not be more inwardly blessed than the rest that comes to a man's soul when he yields at last to the invitations of the gospel and commits himself to Christ as his Lord and his Saviour. There remains much for him to learn and much to overcome; but the antagonism is gone, the anxiety is over. He has taken the yoke of Christ upon himself and he has found his yoke easy and his burden light. He has found "rest unto his soul." He has peace with God.

"*Into this grace.*" Something more than the word to "cease firing" has gone forth. There is reconstruction to be accomplished now. Paul had a sort of geographic imagination. "Into this grace"—as if we were in a sort of enclosure, separate from the world, protected from the cold winds of fear and the reach of danger. Overhead bend the blue skies and radiant glory of God's favor. It is a gracious place to be in. Paul's suggested idea is that now being at peace with God, we are the recipients of many spiritual blessings that can be had only "in this grace." If any one hesitates to see the exceeding value of being thus "enclosed in his grace," let him look about among his more intimate friends, and ask whether those who are "in this grace" do give evidence of having blessings that are not among the other class. Are their ideals of life higher and more refined? Do they have a calmness in the presence of troubles or danger that,

other things being equal, others fail to possess. Have they a hope that is an anchor to their souls when storms arise on the ocean of their life that holds them stedfast? I think such an observation will satisfy the inquiring mind that there are blessings of that sort reserved only for those who are "in this grace." And we may bring it closer home. In the case of you who have come "into this grace" is it not true that you have had blessings since you came into it that were unknown to you before? Does not life seem to you more worth living? Are there not compensations and consolations for you as you walk through hard places that were wholly unknown before you came "into this grace"?

"*Access by faith.*" How do men get "into this grace"? "Access by faith," says Paul. It is by the submissive committal of ourselves to Christ that we are thus favored to enter the enclosure. It is the same idea that Jesus taught when he said: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one cometh unto the Father but by me" (John 14 : 6). It is the same that Peter preached to the troubled souls in Jerusalem at Pentecost: "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ . . . and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2 : 38). Faith in Jesus is the doorway to all the complete blessings God has in store for us. Not a philosophy to be understood; not a holiness to be attained by self-discipline; not a theology to be mas-

tered and confessed; but faith in Jesus. This was Paul's view in Corinth where he determined to know nothing but Jesus and him crucified. (1 Cor. 2 : 2.) It was the same when the jailer at Philippi sought light. (Acts 16 : 31.) If any man is seeking to come "into this grace" the only way is faith in Jesus. In Antioch the disciples held meetings day after day and preached to the people. Paul came there and for a whole year taught much people. But as they went home from the sessions they were asked what he had talked about, and they said, "About Christ." When men were planning to go and hear him they said, "Let us go and hear this man talk about Christ." So persistent were the disciples in this that people said, "These people are Christians, they talk nothing but Christ." With us there is much after faith, but faith is fundamentally necessary as a condition of entering "this grace."

"*We rejoice in the hope of the glory of God.*" However rich may be the "earnest of our inheritance," and however luscious the "first-fruits," the great bulk of "this grace" remains in the region of hope. The present may be ever so blessed, the future has much more in store. Peter expressed it in this fashion, "God hath begotten us again unto a living hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you who, by the power of God,

are guarded, through faith, unto a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time" (1 Peter 1 : 3-5). "We are saved in hope," wrote Paul. "But hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for it? But if we hope for that which we see not, then do we with patience wait for it" (Rom. 8 : 24, 25). But we hope for the "glory of God." Some read this to mean that we shall see the glorious royal state of God. As Jesus said, "The Son of man shall come in his glory and all the angels with him" (Matt. 25 : 31). Others read it to mean that we shall see the "splendor in which he lives" (Beet). Another, "We shall share in God's glory" (Weymouth). Another, "We shall attain the glorious ideal God has for us" (Twentieth Century). Jesus said, "I desire that they may be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me" (John 17 : 24). But he also said, "The glory which thou hast given me I have given them" (John 17 : 22). So I think we may say that Paul's idea includes both the vision of God's spiritual splendor, and also the sharing of it ourselves; as John wrote, "We shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is" (1 John 3 : 2).

But how impossible it is for us to conceive or to express in any satisfactory way the spiritual glory for which we look. It must be one of character as well as of body. Put together all the highest virtues in perfect proportions and in full measure;

give us the patience of Job, the faith of Abraham, the courage of young David, the insight of Isaiah, the zeal of Amos, the enthusiasm of Peter, the tenderness of John, the energy of Paul, and fuse them all together with love like that of Jesus, and you have the kind of individuals we should be. But the future will not be a set of individuals. It will be a society. When the writer of Revelation sought to give us an idea of the coming glory, he told of a city coming down from God out of heaven! Then, with figures that are impossible in fact, he sought to tell how that night and sickness and sorrow and sighing and death are all banished; while song and love and praise and usefulness are everywhere. Such are the sketches in metaphor of the glory of God for which we hope. As it has been left to our imaginations, we are at liberty to use them to the full. The only limit is that we must not allow any sin to mar our picture, for the glory of God is the beauty of holiness.

The religion of Confucius is one of memory; that of Buddha one of extinction; that of the Stoic one of endurance; that of the Epicurean one of forgetfulness. The religion of Christ is one of hope. He regenerates the very word. In classic use its meaning was "Expectancy of evil or good." In his use it means only future good. It has a sure foundation. We are not saved because we hope we are. It is not founded upon experience or personal attainment. Christianity is founded upon a fact. The true hope is in the risen Christ. Criticism, scholarship, hate, ridicule, have stormed around that stone rolled from

the door of the sepulcher, but there it still lies bearing upon it the gospel of our hopes.

The risen Christ is the assurance of a completed service, of an accepted sacrifice and a present spirit. If Christ be not risen, we may as well pull down our churches and go to work again building towers of Babel. Our hope is not in that we help God, but that God helps us. "While I live I hope" is the proverb of humanity. "While I die I hope" is the triumphant chant of grace.

Eternity we recognize as our inexhaustible treasure-house, and through our hope, as through a window, we catch glimpses that inspire. Its thought is inspiration; its gleam is strength. The golden age is not back yonder, but ever before us. We keep our eye on the sun and the shadows of earth are kept behind us and our eyes glow with the sunlight. When hope fails, the man dies. (Rev. Wallace Radcliffe.)

"We exult in tribulation." Some one may say: "Yes it is very well to tell about the glory that is coming, but here and now the Christians have persecution and adversity. They have too much religion to enjoy the world and too much world to enjoy religion." "No," says Paul, "we are not cast down by such things. On the other hand we exult—we triumph in the midst of tribulations. There are fountains open in the heart that overflow with help and consolations even when we are suffering persecutions."

All the history of the church has borne witness to that. When in 1536 near Antwerp in Germany William Tyndale was being burned at the stake for printing the Bible for his fellow countrymen, he

forgot his sufferings and prayed, "O Lord, open the king of England's eyes." When in 1555 in Oxford, England, Bishop Latimer was burning at the stake he said to Ridley who was burning beside him: "Play the man, brother. To-day we shall light a fire by God's grace that I trust will never be put out." Thousands upon thousands have had the same kind of help when they have been in circumstance of trial. It is the common faith of the church to-day that grace will be given for every occasion. And this optimism is needed greatly.

The war is bringing out a large demand for Christian men who are "good fellows" to go to France in the service of the Young Men's Christian Association. They are to be stationed in the Association centers, to assist in maintaining the morale of the army, to serve the soldiers' needs in little attentions that army life cannot confer. These men are expected to assist in keeping the soldiers clean and capable, to encourage and participate in the field sports, and to furnish a good example for the men in practical and manly Christian living. General Pershing has so far recognized the value of this service that he has asked for four thousand such leaders who are above draft age and physically fitted for the hardships of army life.

In all parts of the country men of the type desired have been responding to the call, and doubtless still more are wanted and will be wanted until the war is ended. It should not be difficult for a Christian nation to furnish them in ample numbers. The modern, hale-fellow, out-of-doors, glad-he-is-alive variety of man is desired, and the United States for some years has been growing this type of citizen.

The old-style variety of long-faced, melancholy, depressing type of Christian has been "going out" for many years. It has been sensed that the religion of Christ requires no immolation of live manhood or womanhood; that a Christian should be a cheerful optimist, with more reason for being glad and for distributing gladness than the unbeliever. Religion does not require of its adherents that they deprive themselves of all human characteristics; that they put on sackcloth and ashes and go through life sadly bewailing their lot. On the contrary, the Christian promise should case-harden them to trouble and make them cheerfully ready for whatever the future may bring.

It is this spirit that General Pershing is conferring upon his soldiers, a spirit that even now makes them noticeable among their brethren of other nations in the field. It is this spirit that keeps American troops fine and fit and cheerful in any circumstances, and hardens not only their will to victory but their physical bodies to endurance.—*Seattle Post-Intelligencer.*

"*Tribulation worketh steadfastness.*" The reason for the exulting is that the very tribulations that look so formidable from the outside are active in the production of qualities that more peaceful circumstances fail to develop. First of all is steadfastness. That is a great word. We speak of home*stead,* that is the place of the home; bed*stead* is the place of the bed; *stead*fast is place-fast. That is, one sticks to his place and his faith. One does not know whether he has steadfastness until he has faced some storm that would drive him from his anchorage. But when he has faced and defeated tribulation, he knows his own heart, and others know it.

This steadfastness works approval. Mr. Moody used to mark passages in his Bible "T & P"; that meant "tried and proved." So the man who has suffered for Christ's sake marks his faith "T & P"—"tried and proved."

"And approval hope; and hope maketh not ashamed." That is, a hope that will not disappoint its possessors. It might be said that: "It is well to keep up a cheerful mind in all this trouble; better than to despair; but after all it is only an optimistic speculation. We do not know what the reality of the future may be. It may all turn out to be a beautiful mirage, or a rainbow made by faith shining through our tears. How do we know?" We know by the fact that now in this present life we have the first-fruits, the beginning of what is promised. "Well, what is that? Pray tell." It is this: The love of God is already shed abroad in our hearts. We have now the most evident and satisfactory results. We love God whereas we used to fear him. We war against the evil desires of the flesh which once we served. We cherish a hope which once was a stranger to us. Our tempers are softened; our tongues are being tamed; our bitternesses are getting sweetened; our ambitions are getting more spiritual; our vision of ourselves is enlarged and uplifted. We love to read the teachings of Jesus. We delight in the company of such as worship God. Indeed, in all that is permanent about us we may say without exaggeration we are

"new creatures in Christ Jesus." Such are the things that guarantee our hope is founded in truth. That hope will not put us to shame.

Such then are the results of being justified by faith. We have peace with God, access to God's favor, hope of glory, triumph in persecutions, first-fruits that give us satisfactory assurance.

It will be of great service to us if we not infrequently take time to consider and estimate these results.

CHAPTER VI

THE GREAT COMPENSATION

"As in Adam all die, so in Christ are all made alive."—1 Cor. 15 : 22.

XENOPHON reported Homer as saying that Ulysses was a "sure orator" because he framed his reasonings on things that are acknowledged by all mankind. It may not be said that Paul always did that; but he framed his reasonings on things that were acknowledged by those to whom he wrote. The passage we are studying now is one that gives great perplexity to many because it rests upon an idea of sin and death that finds hostility in many minds. The old doctrine of the New England catechism that "In Adam's fall we sin-ned all," awakens more hostility than almost any other doctrine of the church. I wish to consider this disagreeable doctrine as given in this chapter.

There are two facts to be recognized preliminary to an understanding of the passage. First, Paul had a very fertile imagination that he used actively in illustrating his thought. It has been said of Henry Ward Beecher that an abstract, obscure idea passed through his mind became luminous by his concrete illustrations. Paul was an expert in

that art. It will help us to an understanding of this to recall some of his figures. Writing to the Corinthians, and wishing to explain his method a little, he says, "I have fed you with milk and not with meat" (1 Cor. 3 : 2). Wishing to show them that there should be no jealousies among teachers, he says: "I planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. He that planteth and he that watereth are one" (1 Cor. 3 : 6, 8). Changing his figure, he says: "Ye are God's building. I laid a foundation, others build thereon. But a day is coming when the fire will test the work of each" (1 Cor. 3 : 9, 10, 13). When he would tell of the moral effects of faith in Christ, he says, "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace," etc. (Gal. 5 : 22). When he would tell how the law of Moses influenced men to take Christ, he said, "The law was a schoolmaster to lead us to Christ" (Gal. 3 : 24). And perhaps the most striking instance of a semidramatism is found in his attempt to teach the triumph of Christ over death. He pictures Christ as fighting the enemies of his reign in the open. One after another of the hostile agencies is defeated; for "He must reign until he has put all enemies under his feet." And now there remains only one more. That is Death—"the last enemy." All other forces have been defeated—annihilated is the word. Christ stands the master of the world except that Death the dread monster remains to contend with him and to defeat his plans. Then

the trumpet sounds, and Death is forced to own the victor.

> The powers of Death have done their worst,
> But Christ their legions hath dispersed.
> Let shouts of holy joy outburst.
>
> The Prince of life with Death has striven,
> To cleanse the earth his blood has given,
> Has rent the veil and opened heaven.

One cannot follow his picture with care and an active imagination without having a thrill of personal triumph that leads one to say with Paul, "O grave, where is thy victory? O Death, where is thy sting?"

The second fact to be considered is that figures of speech must not be taken as theological formulæ. They are the clothing of ideas, not the ideas themselves.

In this passage (Rom. 5 : 12-21), Paul, to a large extent, dramatizes the situation. He has been teaching them that we are justified by our vital association with Jesus.[1] In that associational way his excellence is imputed to us; his obedience—even unto death—is in some way made to declare the righteousness of God in passing over our sins; so that he is not subject to the imputation of indifference to sin when he justifies sinners. The whole of this teaching rests upon the idea that Christ un-

[1] See page 30.

der some view both in his suffering and his obedience represents us.

But that representative idea is the one that Jews of his day and many Americans of our day dislike. The most subtle antagonism to the gospel makes its last defense on this point of imputation. Paul said he sought his "own righteousness." The Jews sought "to establish their own righteousness" and did not "subject themselves to the righteousness of God" (Rom. 10 : 3). The whole desire for "works" was based upon the subtle, semiunconscious desire to be independent of God. This same subtle antagonism growing out of a mistaken pride of personality finds expression in such words as the following, from a teacher of Christian theology who is—doubtless without hostile intent—led away by his philosophical bent into statements that are wholly adverse to Paul's teaching. He says: "Man is true to the end of his being only in a rational *self*-guidance. . . We cannot rationally think that a rational being can have an end in view that is not *self*-perfecting" or "that he should find a law outside *himself*. . . Nor would it be ethical to find the principle of one's faith and conduct outside one*self*." That is religious anarchy. It is not uncommon to hear Roman Catholics argue that their religion is more likely to be true because they make greater sacrifices for it than others. If there were pilgrimages to be made or heavy burdens imposed, many would accept them if, in so doing, they could

only have the assurance that they were earning their salvation.

This dislike of being in the halo of anybody's goodness and thus being recipients of grace was, in the minds of those to whom Paul wrote, a great hindrance; and to all such as now hesitate his word is equally unwelcome. But it is worth while to hear what he says:

He calls up in memory the history written in Genesis, and with which his readers were all familiar, for Moses was read in all their synagogues. (Acts 15 : 21.) Here is Adam in the dawn of human history standing alone before God. He is given a command and great privileges. He sins, and as a result death becomes his penalty. But Adam is the Begetter of the human race. Their moral and physical constitution they inherit from him. Their station in the created world they get from him. Whether it be for good or for evil, this is the fact everywhere evident. "In Adam all died" by the operation of the same law that makes it certain that in Adam all are men and not monkeys, and no monkeys are men. "Every seed after its kind" is a sentence written all over the earth. If Adam became a sinner his descendants are sinners by nature.

"But," says some one, "all men sin for themselves and they are penalized with death for that." No, death is not the penalty for breaking law. "Why not?" says the objector. Because under the

régime of law there can be no sin imputed *before the law is given;* the law *cannot be retroactive.* And yet men died during all the ages from Adam to Moses before the law was given. And they did not die for disobedience of some special command, after the manner of Adam. They must therefore have been penalized because they were the children of Adam. And all his children are included in the penalty. So it is evident that the principle of being represented by the great Begetter of our race in his sin is a living and active one all through the ages. Every dying child bears witness to that fact. It is not by personal disobedience that death is passed upon all men, but by reason of our great Begetter Adam's sin. So the *principle* of *heredity* is established by Paul after the fashion of Ulysses, appealing to what every one must acknowledge. Paul so far is a true reasoner.

"But," says some one, "this is a hard saying. Does it seem to be just that the children should suffer for the sins of the parents? Did not Jeremiah, when he saw the happy state of Israel, say that 'In those days they will not say, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge: but every one shall die for his own iniquity. Every man that eateth sour grapes, his teeth shall be set on edge'"? (Jer. 31 : 29, 30.)

This is the objection to-day to what is called the doctrine of "original sin." A large part of the objection is due to a misunderstanding of the doc-

trine; but the Pauline idea does have the root of a great antagonism in it. It seems to us unjust, and therefore untrue. For this very reason I think Paul makes a long and detailed statement of the compensations for Adam that God gives us in Christ. He uses the Genesis story, and the confirmatory testimony of all observation not as an example, but as a parallel to certain things in the religious realm. It is "an earthly story with an heavenly meaning." But in using it one must not forget that it is an illustration rather than an argument. It shows a truth in the physical realm to miniature a similar truth in the spiritual realm. So he says, "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive again" (1 Cor. 15 : 22). That is by no means saying that *as many as* in Adam die shall be alive in Christ. It is not a matter of numbers. It is the *principle of heredity* he is setting forth. On the same principle by which all those whom Adam begat shared in his death, all those whom Christ begets will share in his life.

So far the comparison is good and complete. But then Paul goes on to show that while in that particular the cases have a common principle, in the gospel scheme in other particulars the case is far better. He reverses the figure entirely, and contrasts the good received by grace of heredity with the sorrow received by inheritance from Adam. In Adam it was one sin and many sinners; in Christ it was one act of obedience and many made righteous.

In Adam it was unto condemnation; in Christ it was unto justification. If physical relation to Adam brought forth death, much more will faith relation to Christ bring forth life. If justice in God toward Adam brought penalty of death, much more will the grace of God bring forth riches of good.

In every way those who are begotten by Christ find the operation of the law of heredity working abundantly and superabundantly above its working in the lower realm in which Adam was the begetter.

> If Jesus Christ—as we are taught—was slain
> From the foundation of the world, it was
> Because our evil lived in essence then—
> Coeval with the great, mysterious fact.
> And he was slain that we might be transformed,—
> Not into Adam's sweet similitude—
> But the more glorious image of himself,—
> A resolution of our destiny
> As high transcending Eden's life and lot
> As he surpasses Eden's fallen lord.
>
> —*J. G. Holland, Bitter Sweet.*

So if at any time one is disposed for a moment to antagonize the doctrine of heredity let him recall this argument of Paul and see that, mysterious as it may be, nevertheless the compensations are exceeding abundant. So that, as Paul here says, "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin reigned in death, so might grace reign through righteousness, unto eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

If then any man feels that he is unfortunate in having a natural disposition that brings him into trouble, let him claim "this grace" in which he may "stand, and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God."

CHAPTER VII

THE DICTIONARY OF FAITH

"The steps of that faith of our father Abraham."—Rom. 4 : 12.

AFTER Paul has set forth his idea of justification in Romans 3 : 21-26, and added the declaration that the door is wide open both to Jews and Gentiles (Rom. 3 : 30), he knows that some of his readers, or some who would hear his letter read in the meetings of the disciples, would at once begin to examine the matter critically. He had been preaching in all sorts of places, sometimes in synagogues, at other times in market-places, then again in the precincts of idol temples; and just as political speakers among us learn by experience what sort of questions men ask, and what objections they may raise, and reply to them by shaping their addresses beforehand, so Paul inserted in his letter replies to the objections and questions he felt sure would be in the minds of the Roman people to whom he wrote.

One of these objections likely to come from the Jewish part of the church was this: "If you say that the door is open to all alike, what was the special advantage that Abraham, our honored ancestor, possessed?" His reply may be stated in this

form: As far as personal "works" go toward justification he had nothing to his advantage, for we have shown that by works of law no flesh will be justified in His sight; and that on the basis of merit all men are "shortcomers." The Scripture itself tells us that it was his faith, not his "works," that was counted to him for righteousness. That statement must stand unmodified. If he had been justified because of his ethical or ceremonial perfectness he would have had a right to claim justification as a legitimate reward for his excellence, just as a man who has completed a contract has a right to demand his pay. We do not consider that a grocer is under obligation to us because we pay for the goods he has sold us. Payment is his due and our duty, not our grace. David had this in mind when he wrote: "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin." Abraham, therefore, was the recipient of "grace"—that is, of promises that grew out of the gracious disposition of God, not out of the demands of justice, or as a reward for his deeds. The word "forgiveness" carries that idea as its central message.

But some one is saying: "Yes, but that forgiveness was granted because he was circumcised as a saving ceremony. He assented to the ceremony and all that it implied, and as a return he was forgiven." Paul would reply: "No, he was accepted before that. And the ceremony was accepted and

observed as a seal of the forgiveness he had already received." All ceremonies—baptism and the Lord's Supper, for example—are expressions of what has already taken place, not the means of making it take place. They are "outward signs of an inward grace." If a man knowingly observes the sign who has not the things signified, he commits a forgery, tells a lie.

Then Paul proceeds to explain why this was so arranged. It was done so that Abraham might be the father of all who believe—of all "who walk in the steps of that faith" which he had before he observed the ceremony.

We have in this passage, therefore, two truths worth transplanting into our gardens of thought.

First, we get a *dictionary of faith.*

Since faith has been given so great a prominence, it is important that we know what it is.

The terms "father" and "son" are very frequent terms in the Bible. They get their meaning from the fact that fathers send down to their sons some of their strongest peculiarities, and sons resemble their fathers in the same. We see the physical likeness in many ways. I once heard a little girl ask her Sunday School teacher the meaning of the beatitude, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." Her teacher replied, "When you see some little girl on the street, you say, I know who that girl is because she looks like her mother." So peacemakers

are called "children of God" because in their dispositions they are—like God—peacemakers. This explains the use of the terms in the Bible. Satan was called the father of some lying Jews because they resembled the great father of lies. Those that have exceptional sympathy and tact in comforting people in their sorrows are called "sons of consolation." James and John because of their enthusiastic energy were called "sons of thunder" (Mark 3 : 17). Eli's sons were called "sons of wickedness" (1 Sam. 2 : 12). Others, "children of the Evil One." The pious were called "children of God." Jesus was the "Son of God" par excellence. They that are of faith are "children of Abraham" children, not by generation, but by similarity; there is such a spiritual resemblance between the faithful and Abraham as exists between children and parents.

Because of this we see that Abraham's faith is the pattern faith for us. If we desire to know what faith is we look to him for the definition. He is our *dictionary of faith.*

This kind of instruction is very efficient in many things. Faith, like other spiritual qualities, is hard to define verbally. They are abstract matters; and few people deal in abstract goods. Concrete examples of them are easily understood. For example, we all get a good conception of forgiveness when we read the story of the Prodigal Son. (Luke 15.) We know what treachery is when we read of

Judas. (Matt. 26 : 47.) Courage is made plain when we read how Peter and the other apostles facing the same Council that had but a week before condemned their Master to the cross, said, "We cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard" (Acts 4 : 20). Love for men finds its definition in Paul standing handcuffed and fettered before Festus, and, forgetting his own case, saying, "I would that not only thou, but all that hear me this day, might become such as I am—except these bonds" (Acts 26 : 29). So also faith finds its beautiful definition in the life of Abraham. We have a religious song that is called "The Gospel According to You," which points out that in a certain way every Christian is a dictionary of Christianity. In this sense we may speak of the "Gospel According to Abraham." For his version of it Paul certifies when he says, "They that are of faith are children of Abraham," and tells us to walk "in the steps of that faith" which Abraham had. The study of Abraham's life becomes therefore, as Paul suggests, a helpful agency in the furtherance of our religious education.

Not that the actual deeds of Abraham are to be copied, for that would be impossible. But the moral principles and religious faith are to be adopted by us as our guides and example. From the records of his life as given us in the Book we may construct a fair notion of the actual Abraham and let that become an influential standard for us.

Secondly, reading this dictionary we find in its definitions the following elements:

The origin of his faith. There is a mystery about the earliest steps of his faith as there is about our own. We do not know why our hearts turn from an attitude of indifference and perhaps hostility to God to one of faith. An old-fashioned evangelist,[1] when he came to tell his "experience" to the church in which he sought membership, said, "In some way, and I do not know in what way, I fell in love with God and with his people." In some way, and we do not know in what way, we also fall in love with God and fall out of love with what is not godly. Men do not seek Christian things until in some degree and for some reason they feel out of sorts with themselves. The well do not seek the doctor. No man builds a new house unless he is in some measure dissatisfied with the old one. No man adopts a new way of doing business unless he can better himself. If a man has no sense of sin, he will have no desire to seek a Saviour from sin. But the origin of that spiritual discontent lies below the realm of our own self-knowledge.

Isaiah said: "Look unto the hole of the pit from which ye were digged. Look unto Abraham your father. I called him alone and blessed him" (Isa. 51 : 1, 2).

James wrote, "Of his own will he begat us by the word of truth" (James 1 : 18).

[1] Elder Chamberlain, of New Berlin, N. Y.

John wrote, "We are born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John 1 : 13).

And Paul himself wrote that he became a man of Christian faith when it "pleased God to reveal his Son" in him. (Gal. 1 : 15, 16.)

There seems to be a complex agency: moral truth taught from childhood, later a knowledge, more or less full, of the historical Christ, all animated and supplemented by the quickening power of what we call the Spirit of God.

Abraham heard a call to come out from his home and kindred. (Gen. 12 : 1.) So we are cut loose from our kindred so far as they lead us to neglect of our religious duties. We must recognize that in matters of the soul every man must give account of himself to God. He must be separate—not necessarily in work or place or family, but in the essential experiences of religious life. Separate in duty, in hope, in aim, and in destiny. Not to be isolated, but to walk with God and with his people.

He "went out, not knowing whither he went" (Heb. 11 : 8). "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee" (Gen. 12 : 1). It is an instructive picture we have in the account: the old patriarch, with his family about him, mounting the camels and starting away from the place of his birth. One sees in imagination the neighbors coming for a parting interview. They ask him where

he is going and why. He replies: "I do not know where, but to a land that God will show me. I have no map, no plan, but guidance as I go along." This is the pattern faith. When any man submits himself to Christ, he does not know what experiences he may meet in the line of his Christian duty. He cannot tell his own ambitions, for he has none yet. He expects guidance. He is going to things that God will show him. With Professor Gilmore he sings:

> He leadeth me! O blessed thought!
> O words with heavenly comfort fraught!
> Whate'er I do, where'er I be,
> Still 'tis God's hand that leadeth me.

We all go by a way we have not known before. Most ministers say that if they had known the perplexities to be found in the places they accepted, they would not have dared to accept. But feeling that they were where the Master put them, they have leaned upon him and gone forward, in joyful obedience, to good successes.

His faith saturated his daily life. His was not simply a desire to get somewhere, but to be somebody. The record shows how carefully he cultivated the ethical quality of his life. He kept himself from the canker of covetousness. When Lot, his nephew, sought more than was really his due, Abraham said: "The land is too small for us both. Now you take the part you like best, and I will

take the rest." So he saw Lot take the fertile valley while he remained in the hills. When the herdsmen of Abimelech strove with his own, he said, "Let there be no strife between us" (Gen. 13 : 8). He valued neighborly kindness and peace more than pastures for sheep. That disposition dethrones King Mammon in many hearts.

He was a man of prayer. (Gen. 12 : 8; 13 : 4, 18.) When he first came to Palestine he built an altar and called on the name of Jehovah, and named the place "The House of God." Later in life he sought it out and made it a place for worship, seeking the blessing of God on his family and himself.

He was given to hospitality, as we see in the record of his entertainment of the angel at Mamre. (Gen. 18 : 1.)

He taught his family the rudiments of religion. It was written of him, "I know him, that he will surely command his children and his household after him, and they will keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment" (Gen. 18 : 19).

He was not "too proud to fight" (Gen. 14; 17 : 9-18, 23-27). When the neighboring tribes had attacked Lot and carried him and his household off as prisoners, and taken his goods as booty, Abraham at once armed his servants and pursued the rascals, fought them, defeated them, brought back his nephew, and all his goods. He was no molly-coddle. If he was not always in a state of prepar-

edness, it did not take him long to get into it when the proper occasion arose.

But he sought no gain from war. (Gen. 14 : 23, 24.) The legitimate spoil from the enemy he gave to others who had suffered from such incursions before, but for himself he said: "No, not even a shoe-string for me. I fought not for territory, nor for ambition, nor for royal prerogatives, but for the sake of the oppressed, to give them liberty and to 'make it safe' for them in property and life."

He was obedient in the highest degree. (Gen. 22 : 1-12.) It had been promised to him that "in Isaac" his seed should be called, and that they should be as numerous as the stars of heaven. But one day he was told that he should go up and offer Isaac as a burnt sacrifice to God. He made no argument about it, but in silence took the boy and laid him on the altar, ready to the last minute to obey the command which not only took his beloved son of his loved Sarah, but took the very one in whom all the promises were centered, for if Isaac died how could he have a numerous progeny? In the book of Hebrews it is written that "by faith he offered Isaac." Doubtless he did make the full surrender in his heart. But the writer of Hebrews adds, "accounting that God was able to raise him from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure" (Heb. 11 : 19).

He was a covenant-keeping man. (Gen. 14 : 22.) For him agreements were more than "scraps of

paper." They bound him sacredly to fulfilment, and those who knew him trusted him implicitly.

It is in these great virtues, both of conduct and of faith, that he is given us as our example—our dictionary of faith—the steps of whose faith we are encouraged to follow that we may be ourselves spiritually children of Abraham and heirs with him of the promises.

CHAPTER VIII

PAUL'S "GOD FORBIDS"

As we follow Paul's thought through this letter we see that his method was to lay down great principles and establish them with proofs taken at times from history (Rom. 4 : 1-25), again from observation (Rom. 1 : 18-32), and again from his own experience. (Rom. 7 : 7-25.)

Then he considers the questions that his readers would be likely to ask and the objections they might raise.

Since human nature has not changed, the same questions are now asked and the same objections raised. For that reason a careful study of his replies will be helpful to us.

Nine times in this letter he writes the same Greek phrase which in our version is translated as "God forbid."[1] Each case is connected with an almost necessary inference from his statements, but which one feels at once is erroneous. Although the logical situations as he faithfully develops them seem to heap up a weight of compelling warrant, he repudiates these inferences with his vehement "God forbids."

[1] An exact translation would be, "Let it not be so." But the phrase carries an element of seriousness about it that makes "God forbid" a fair equivalent for it.

In chapter 3 : 4, after saying that the Jews had broken faith with God, he says, in substance: "Shall their lack of faithfulness excuse Him from being faithful? God forbid."

In chapter 3 : 6, he says: "If sin furnish a background upon which the grace of God shows itself, is not God unjust to punish the sinner who thus helps him to show off to advantage his great grace? God forbid."

In chapter 6 : 2, after saying that God's plan is intended to glorify the grace of God, he raises the question: "If sin makes grace to abound, why not make the practice of sin the daily order of our lives that grace may have a fine opportunity to shine out? God forbid."

In chapter 7 : 7, after showing that the invariable effect of law is to awaken in human hearts antagonism that leads to sin and condemnation, he asks: "Is not a law that thus awakens sin a sinful thing itself? God forbid."

In chapter 9 : 14, after having said that before the sons of Rebecca had done either good or evil—even before they were born—God had said that the elder should serve the younger (which was in those times a dishonor to the elder)—he asks: "Is God then unjust in putting the dishonor upon Esau? God forbid."

In chapter 11 : 1, after showing that Israel as a nation had been rejected, he asks: "Has God then cast off his people? God forbid."

And in chapter 11 : 11, when he had reminded his readers that Israel had fallen, he asks: "Was it God's intent that his nation should be at last lost? God forbid."

Each one of these queries is natural. We should raise the same ourselves. We might not so promptly reply as he did, "Let it not be so." In each one of these there is a germinal error from which there has grown a part of great theological systems wrought out with patience and logical skill. For men have said: "Why should Paul forbid us to follow the logical trend of his statement? Are not the rules of logic binding upon us? If we accept a statement, are we not bound to accept all its logical consequences? And if the logical consequences are unacceptable, does it not show that the statement was erroneous? If these statements lead to unacceptable conclusions, must they not be revised?"

George Eliot somewhere wrote that the doctrine of justification by faith is an encouragement to sin.

In every age since Paul's time Antinomianism has had a large following. Hyper-Calvinism has found disciples in the most intellectual circles. The president of the college from which I graduated said to me at one time, "I suppose I am at heart a hyper-Calvinist."

Human logic has said, "If God elects some men to salvation, then he by inference elects others to be lost."

When apparent evil comes to good men some have said, "There can be no overruling Providence or these men would not suffer." Others have said with Job's unprofitable friends, "The goodness of the men was not genuine."

When riches come to wicked men while poverty remains a guest at the table of the good the complaint of the Psalmist echoes, "In vain have I cleansed my heart, and washed my hands in innocency, for all day long I have been plagued, and chastened every morning" (Ps. 73 : 13, 14).

When the love of God has been presented men have become universalists, saying that love cannot allow a soul to be lost.

When evil seems to be dominant men have said with an English philosopher, "I would be ashamed to make a world like this."

As I was speaking one night in a schoolhouse upon the case of the Amalekites, a man in the audience rose and said,

"May I ask a question?"

"Certainly," I replied.

"Did you not tell us the other night that God is good?"

"I certainly did."

"Well, how do you harmonize that with this command to kill all the women and children of the Amalekites?"

A little boy asked his mother,

"Mother, is not God good and powerful?"

"Certainly, my son."

"Why then does he not kill the devil and be done with it?"

A man exhorted by the deacons of his church to resume his walk with the church replied, "I know I am a wandering sheep, but I expect the Good Shepherd to come and bring me back." But he did not so much as turn his face toward the fold from which he had strayed.

These are samples of the reasonings that appear along the line of Christian history as often as weeds appear in a garden. For this reason let us examine some of the replies that Paul made to such things.

In chapter 6 : 2, in rejoinder, when some one says, "Let us sin that grace may abound," he says, "How can we who are dead to sin continue therein?" That is, How can we conclude for any reason that it is our duty to sin? But why may we not do so? Because the very fundamental aim of the Christian life is to get rid of sin. It was for that reason we became disciples of Christ. Any idea that interferes with that must be discarded as absurd. Logic or no logic, that purpose to get rid of sin must be kept dominant.

In chapter 9 : 11, to the saying that God was unjust in his dealings with Esau, the reply is: "God's righteousness is fundamental. It is the major premise of all reasonings. Nothing can be true that discredits his character. If therefore we say that he dealt unjustly with Esau we discredit him,

and that is religiously absurd, and must be erroneous."

In chapter 7 : 7 the premise is: "God's law is just." Any view that disputes it is erroneous. Even if the law appears to produce sin it must be explained in some other way than by impugning God's justness.

So through all these cases we find that he does not answer directly the objections. They are logically unanswerable by logic alone. He makes his appeal to great "Unquestionables"—great "Fundamentals" that are taken as major premises—things so firmly embedded in the hearts that they cannot be disturbed.

To transplant this method is our true refuge from the imperfect reasonings of distrustful hearts. "Let God be true though every man a liar." Let God be just though every man a sinner. Let Christ be crowned in our hearts though every other teacher be discredited. So the blind man in the gospel story (John 9), when he could not reply to the questions put to him by the Pharisees, affirmed: "I do not know whether Jesus is a sinner or not. One thing I know, whereas I was blind, now I see." When they pressed him further, he fell back on a "fundamental." "If this man were not from God he could do nothing of this kind. Since he has done it he must be from God."

So we must come back to the idea that such things as the *gospel of God* does in human hearts and in

society can only be done by the truth, and hence these things of the gospel are true and come from God.

What are some of these "fundamentals"?

God is himself the sum and source of all goodness. The very name "God" implies a being "than whom no greater or better can be imagined." If "God" be not good then our minds would create for us a being that is good. If "God" be not all powerful then we will create in our thinking a being that is so. In any direction of wisdom, power, and love that we may think, out at the end of the line of our thinking God is found as the ocean is found beyond our vision. He surrounds our thought like a boundless sea. He is king of kings. He is father of the fatherless. He is the standard of all justice. He is the fountain of all mercy. He is the fire of judgment against all iniquity. "Out of his mouth cometh wisdom and understanding." He knows the end from the beginning. We cannot better express our idea of him than in the words of the prophet Isaiah (Isa. 40 : 12-17):

"Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with a span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance? Who hath directed the Spirit of Jehovah, or, being his counselor, hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of justice,

and taught him knowledge and showed to him the way of understanding? Behold the nations are as the drop of a bucket, and are accounted as the small dust of the balance. Behold he taketh up the isles as a very little thing. And Lebanon is not sufficient to burn nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt-offering. All the nations are as nothing before him, they are accounted by him as less than nothing, and vanity."

God is revealed in creation. If there is a "class who have contracted toward religion a repugnance that makes them overlook the fundamental verity contained in it," [2] or if they adopt the idea that "the Power which the universe manifests is utterly inscrutable," [3] or if, with Mr. Wells, they hold that the Creator is a "veiled being," and rest in the name that Professor Huxley gave to himself—agnostic—then for all practical purposes they are atheists. If the reader of this has come to such a place, I am unable to help him untangle his feet from the net of these troublesome inferences.[4]

But if Paul were to be asked about this I think he would say that if we are agnostic about the "veiled Being," it is our fault, for the "invisible things of God are clearly seen in the things that are made" (Rom. 1 : 20).

He does not say "are reasonably inferred," but

[2] Spencer, "First Principles," sec. 5.

[3] Spencer, sec. 16.

[4] An excellent discussion of this will be found in "Reconstruction of Religious Beliefs," by W. H. Mullock.

they are "seen." That is, some ideas of greatest value do not come to the soul through the door of reason. They are not brought to us over the mail-route of logic, nor even by the aeroplane of ecclesiastical authority; but they come by the wireless system of intuition. They vibrate through the universe from the throne and are available for all who will be responsive to them. Does a man know that he loves his only son because his reason tells him so? Does he know that a landscape is beautiful, or that Niagara is grand or that thunder is reverence-inspiring, or that a bright sun thrills him with vigor—these and many more great experiences, are they the product of reason, and do we wait the processes of logic before we know them? To ask the question is to answer it. These fundamental conceptions are intuitions. Reverence for the Being that made us, confidence in the goodness of the author of goodness, faith in a being of infinite power and unfailing wisdom are the multiplication-table of all thinking on morals or religion. Logic may confirm and clarify them, but they exist in large measure independent of logic.

"*I am with you always.*" It is said by many that the world is getting worse and worse; that the church is corrupt; that wickedness is rampant; that the idea that the gospel of God has power to redeem the world is contradicted by the facts of history and the observation of the open-eyed. These say that the church is not only failing to be victorious, but

that the Saviour taught us it was to be so. His word about the pervasive methods of the gospel are twisted into a prophecy that the leaven of evil would utterly "spoil the meal."

There is no use in arguing with such errorists. No idea can be gotten out of any mind except by the door it went in at. And this idea did not go in at the door of reason. It went in either through an unjustifiable fear, or spiritual laziness, or great lack of an intelligent faith.

But we fall back on the "fundamental" that Jesus sent out his disciples with the purpose of preaching to the world, and with the promise that he would be with them even unto the end. To say that with such a commission and such a guide the church is to fail is too absurd to need refuting.

For the church to fail would be for him to fail. The true church is his body, so Paul said; and is that body to rot out with evil diseases? No! Because he is the Christ we believe he will win the love of the world. Every victorious people will bring the crowns of their victory and lay them down at his feet and say, "Thou art worthy to receive the honor."

By what processes it may be brought about no man knows. We know that he has told us what to do, and has said that every knee shall bow to him. If he has additional agencies to promote the victory, they will be set at work as they are needed. If the time be long or short, a day is with him as

a thousand years and a thousand years as one day. His kingdom does not run on time-tables like a railroad. Its Superintendent acts as the farmer does. He plants his corn or cuts his wheat when the time is ripe for it. Things are done in "due season," in the "fulness of times."

If we sometimes are discouraged by the fact that some evil rich seem to be more the favorites of God than some saintly poor, we are not to infer that God has forgotten. We are not to sing the song of doubt.

Evil has won in the horrid feud
Of ages with the throne.
Evil stands on the neck of good
And rules the world alone.

There is no good; there is no God;
And faith is a heartless cheat
That bares the back for the devil's rod
And scatters thorns for the feet.

We fall back on the "fundamental" that God is God and God is true. We sing the song of faith:

Evil is only the slave of good,
Sorrow the servant of joy.
And the soul is mad that refuses food
From the meanest in God's employ.

The fountain of joy is fed by tears
And love is lit by the breath of sighs.
The deepest griefs and the wildest fears
Have holiest ministries.[5]

[5] Holland, "Bitter Sweet."

If men point to the world war and say, "What good is the victory of democracy over kaiserism to those who have given their life in securing it?" we say that all the New Testament teaches us that the hope of the world is in the resurrection, that is, in the continuance of life in another world. And that the fruitage of a right life here will be gathered there. If there be no future life, then the Christian is most surely destined to disappointment. But, after all, the consciousness of being right even at great cost of inconvenience or suffering or even death is worth more in the soul's market now, as it was in Moses' time, than all the riches of Egypt.

The Bible is reliable in matters of religion. If men say that there are errors in the Bible and therefore it is not to be trusted, we say that it has a current of ideas running through it that have never failed to bring peace to the soul. And on that great "fundamental" we fall back. It tells us of a God whose ways are ways of pleasantness and whose paths are paths of peace for the soul that seeks not to satisfy curiosity but guidance in life and hope in the future. Any inference contrary to that we put into the class of "inadmissibles."

Christian experience can be trusted. If at some time of spiritual drouth one is tempted to say that there is no certain proof of the gospel of God sufficient to warrant our full dependence upon it, we reply that the most certain and real things of life

are the changes that take place in the chambers of our own consciousness. We know that when we trust and obey Christ the most fully we have the best experiences of life. We know that in such time we have the greatest strength to resist evil, the greatest comfort in our many sorrows, the highest ambitions for life, the greatest courage to meet difficulties. We know also that after we did ally ourselves with Christ our likes and dislikes exchanged places. The pages of the Bible took on a new interest, the companionship with the best people of our own time and the regard for the best people of past times became more agreeable. We think of these changes with gladness. So we say, Whatever questions may be raised, this we know: faith in Christ always works good and not evil. God forbid that we should close the fountain of comfort and peace to ourselves and to others.

And so we might go through the whole list of perplexities and find that the solution is not in tracing out every root of mistake, or correcting every unwarranted inference, but in drowning the perplexity of small things in a sea of faith in the "fundamentals." That was Paul's method.

Herbert Spencer concluded very illogically that because we cannot know God fully, or even grasp any of his attributes completely, therefore God is absolutely unknowable. But if that were true we cannot know anything about anything. For what subject is there of which we can say that we know

all about it in any single direction? We do know many things about God. We know that he is good, and wise, and reliable in all his ways. So when we meet with things in our thinking or in our lives that are beyond our depth, we fall back on our conception of him and do as the Psalmist did, "commit our ways unto God, trust also in him."

Life's mysteries are solved by life,
And doubts that rise in anxious strife
Before the love of God decline.

We seek in worldly phrase to paint
The Unknown God to finite eyes.
Our logic kills our charity,
Our wisdom widens mystery,
Our altars bear no sacrifice.

Faith born of love and fed by hope
Sees God where reason's eye is dim,
And reason led by faith will prove
So strong that doubts will never move,
Nor clouds disturb our trust in him.

CHAPTER IX

THE GOSPEL OF GOD IN PANTOMIME AND PERSONIFICATION

PANTOMIME

One of the interesting elements of Paul's letters is the raciness of his style. He has an active observation, an analytic mind, and a vivid imagination. His metaphors come from several sources because he was observant. The life of the soldier, the scenes of the court-room, the work of the carpenter, the activities of the farmer, were easily pressed into service to help him convey his thought to his readers. His use of these agencies is a fruitful study. In this chapter I wish to notice his explanation of baptism, and his allegoric presentation of the gospel.

Pantomime is a series of actions staged to express ideas without any words. In its simplest form it may be no more than a system of sign language such as American Indians use among themselves. But in its maturer stages it is a more formal and complex set of actions. It might be called a "silent sermon."

This way of communicating ideas was very common in the prophetic days. As an instance we may read in Jeremiah 19: "Then said Jehovah, Go and

buy a potter's bottle, and take of the elders of the people, and of the elders of the priests; and go forth into the valley of the son of Hinnom which is by the gate Harsith, and proclaim there the words that I shall tell thee. . . . Then shalt thou break the bottle in the sight of the men that go with thee, and thou shalt say unto them: Thus saith Jehovah of hosts; even so will I break this people and this city as one breaketh a potter's vessel that cannot be made whole again."

Another may be found in Ezekiel 4 : 1-3: "Thou also, son of man, take thee a tile, and lay it before thee, and portray upon it a city, even Jerusalem: and lay siege against it, and build forts against it; and cast up a mound against it; set camps also against it, and plant battering rams against it round about. And take unto thee an iron pan, and set it for a wall of iron between thee and the city, and set thy face toward it, and it shall be besieged, and thou shalt lay siege against it. This shall be a sign unto the house of Israel."

Israel understood the meaning of such things with double certainty.

In a much more elaborate and dignified way the temple service was ordered as an object-lesson. The very sacredness of the temple precincts began the lesson. Then the priest clothed in white, with his breastplate of beauty and elegance, coming in silence to offer the blood of the sacrifice, and then going in solemn march to the inner sanctum swing-

ing the censer of burning incense, while the people waited in expectation until he returned from the symbolic presence of God in their behalf—that was impressive indeed. When the queen of Sheba came and saw it, she said: "The half had not been told me. Happy are thy men, and happy are these thy servants that stand before thee continually."

One cannot think carefully of the temple or the tabernacle, and fail to see how wisely the use of ceremonial pantomime was utilized to impress truth about God and salvation.

As language improved and general culture increased, the need for pantomime lessened. In the New Testament we have but little of it. The high priest rent his clothes when Jesus was before him (Mark 14 : 63), the apostles shook off the dust from their feet as they left cities that had mistreated them (Acts 13 : 51), the Jews threw dust into the air to express their disgust and anger. (Acts 22 : 23.) Jesus made a dignified use of this expressive agency when he gave the ordinances of baptism and of the Lord's Supper.

Paul is replying to the supposed question of some man that has heard the statement that the Christian way of life was originally intended to exalt the grace of God: "Well then, Let us sin that grace may abound." I have spoken of a part of Paul's reply in the chapter on "Paul's God Forbids." But he is not satisfied to leave the matter. He brings another argument into use. He says:

"Know ye not that so many of you as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him, through baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6 : 3, 4). Taking this passage in connection with other teachings of Paul and of Jesus, I am obliged to think that Paul's idea here is not that baptism was a channel of grace. It was not procurative of any change in relations of the soul to God by reason of any miraculous operation. It was an act to be performed by the believer and the baptizer for the purpose of showing in pantomime the fundamental ideas of the "*gospel of God.*" It certainly is an impressive ceremony when administered as it was intended, in serious view of its meaning. A believer—one who has committed himself to Christ because he feels the need of a new life, and knows that only in Christ he can have it—he therefore having heard the apostolic preaching about baptism—comes to the administrator and says: "I have joined myself to Christ. I want to follow his instruction and be baptized. I want to confess my union with him and my trust in his atoning death and triumphant resurrection by the ceremony he designated."

Then the administrator and the believer—as in the case of Philip and the eunuch (Acts 8 : 38)—go down into the water together, and the administrator buries the believer in the water, and then

raises him from the water, and they go out to the shore or out of the baptistery. Probably at the first all was in silence—no sermon dulled the impression it made—though it is customary now for the company of believers to sing some suitable hymn like the one written by Rev. George W. Bethune, beginning,

> O thou who in Jordan didst bow thy meek head,
> And whelmed in our sorrow didst sink to the dead,
> Then rose from the darkness to glory above,
> And claimed for thy chosen the kingdom of love,
>
> Thy footsteps we follow, to bow in the tide,
> And are buried with thee in the death thou hast died,
> Then wake in thy likeness to walk in the way
> That brightens and brightens to shadowless day—

And then he is sympathetically welcomed into the fellowship of the church.

This pantomime I say makes a great impression, and tells a great gospel, even the "*gospel of God.*"

It is a great pity that certain views about the form of the ordinance[1] and about the miraculous effect of it should have been so much discussed and so bitterly maintained, that the simple beauty of the act itself as a teaching ordinance has been generally overlooked, or, if not, finds it difficult to be looked at with entirely unprejudiced eye.

[1] I received the rite of immersion when I united with the church of Christ. But I am not now concerned to discuss either the question of the form of the ordinance, or whether it may legitimately be changed. I am only opening this passage to view it in its connection.

I am now concerned, however, only with the act as a part of Paul's reply to the question, "Shall we sin that grace may abound?" From his point of view the message of this ordinance was a complete answer to the question asked, and to the suggestion that men sin for the sake of showing the grace of God to better advantage.

Let us see what the argument of the pantomime really was. What did it say to the thoughtful onlooker?

It said four things: 1. It declared a fact of experience. 2. It confessed a faith. 3. It recorded a vow. 4. It expressed a purpose.

The fact declared was that the believer had so united himself to Christ that he considered Christ's death as in some way his own death. Christ had died for him. If the pantomime had stopped in the first section it would have said: This man is dead with Christ, and his funeral is over. He admits that under God's law he is a condemned man, and Christ has taken a place with him as a condemned sinner, and has gone to the cross because of this association.

I am not saying that all the believers saw this clearly or that any of them understood it fully. But I am saying that Paul so interpreted the matter. And that interpretation is in accord with his teachings all the way through his letters.

"I dead with Christ! Christ dead with me!" that was the message.

It confessed a faith in Christ. The fact that a believer had come to baptism was at that time—much more than now—an open acknowledgment that he was a Christian believer. It was not popular then. It carried no social prestige but the contrary. It generally brought reproach and contempt from the élite of the world. But this man says: "I am one of his followers. I belong among his people. If they are dead to the old life, so am I. If they are ready for burial, so am I."

It made a vow. In the Roman empire when a man entered the army he took a vow to be loyal and to be brave. That vow was made with the sanction of religion. Some god was invoked to witness it and to hold him to it. That vow was called in the Roman tongue a *sacramentum,* from which our word sacrament comes. From the first the act of baptism was considered as a vow—a *sacramentum* in which the believer pledged in solemn way his fealty to Jesus and his people. Henceforth he was a citizen of the Christian kingdom. There was no double allegiance. He was to be a stranger and a pilgrim here. He was to look for a "city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God."

When the children of Israel came out of Egypt and crossed the Red Sea, it is said, they were "baptized unto Moses in the sea and in the cloud." That is, they were visibly cut off from Pharaoh, and visibly shut in with Moses. That was taken as a

sort of pantomime showing that after that there was no obligation to Pharaoh but only loyalty to Moses. So men are "baptized unto Christ."

It expressed a purpose. As Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in "newness of life."

Newness of life. If we think of the life of Jesus after his resurrection, we shall see how new it was. It was life of spiritual victory. He had conquered the last enemy.

Such, I take it, was the thought of the Christian as he came up from the water. He had entered into new relations. The old things had passed away. Old allegiance, old hopes, old ethical standards, old associations, old sins, gone. He was a "new creature in Christ Jesus." That view is the only one that will interpret Paul's many allusions to the Christian life consistently. Newness of life was the purpose.

With this exposition of the pantomime in mind, ask yourself if there is in it any answer to the suggestion that we "sin that grace may abound." If a man's profession in baptism is not a mere farce, a counterfeit, a sham, how can he say or think, "I will sin that grace may abound"?

He is dead to all that old régime of sin. Ideally he has no more to do with it than a dead man has with his old associates.

I am not saying that actually such is the case with us or with the early Christians; but ideally it must

be true. If we have any lower ideal we shall fail to reach the goal of the Christian life.

PERSONIFICATION

Although Paul's pantomime of baptism would seem to be a sufficient reply to the suggestion that we sin for the sake of giving the grace of God an opportunity to magnify itself, he was not satisfied to leave the refutation of so subtle a suggestion, which would have serious results on life, to that alone, but he proceeds to present the truth in another way, that is, by personification of the sin.

To catch the full force of his argument it will be helpful to consider the nature of personification. It is a figure of speech in which things that have no personality are mentally and for the time being assumed to have it. Thoughts are ascribed to them, words are put into their mouths, as if they were intelligent beings. For example, in 1 Corinthians 15 : 55 Paul says, as if death could hear him, "O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?"

One of the most vivid cases of personification in our modern times may be found in the preaching of America's greatest negro preacher, John Jasper.[2] "He escorted the Christian to the court of death, and demanded of the monster king to exhibit his power to hurt. It was wonderful to see how he pictured

[2] See W. E. Hatcher, "John Jasper," p. 176.

the high courage of the child of God, marching up to the very face of the king of terrors and demanding that he come forth and do his worst." He cried out: "Grave! Grave!" "Whar's yer vict'ry? I hur you got a mighty banner down dar, an' you t'rrorizes ev'rybody wat comes long dis way. Bring out your armies an' furl fo'th your bann'rs of vict'ry. Show your han' an' let 'em see wat you kin do." But in tones subdued, Grave replies: "Ain't got no vict'ry now. . . King Jesus pars'd through dis country an' tor' my banners down."

This figure gives great additional force to a statement. It calls the imagination into use and thus makes the truth vivid. It is such a way of expression that Paul chose in this passage. He thinks things that pertain to a strong tyrannical owner of slaves who serves himself with them until he is satisfied and then puts them to death. While Paul thus speaks about such a tyrant he is really telling about "this body of sin" as he calls it, and is thus indirectly describing our experience with it. Notice how there runs through the chapter the allusions to this tyrant. Verse 6, "bondage to Sin"; verse 7, "released from Sin"; verse 10, "died unto Sin"; verse 12, "let not Sin reign"; verse 14, "Sin shall not have dominion"; verse 16, "of Sin unto death"; verse 17, "ye were servants of Sin"; verse 18, "made free from Sin"; verse 20, "ye were servants of Sin"; verse 22, "now being made free from Sin"; verse 23, "the wages of Sin is death."

His thought is that sin so permeates and controls this body that it becomes the very agent of the tyrant Sin to bring us to death. Our natural unaided struggle against the tyrant is unsuccessful. But Jesus came and took a place with sinful men and as a sinner, and with them, as a sinner, he was made subject to death. Sin is represented as having fought out the contest with Christ, as he does with us, and obtained a temporary victory over him. As a sinner he was, under the law, condemned, and Death was the executioner of the law. "He died unto Sin." After that, Sin had no more to do with him than the sheriff has with the man who has been executed. "Death has no more dominion over him." As in the pantomime of baptism the death and funeral of Jesus was symbolized, so now Paul says that Jesus has "died to Sin."

But note the surprising thought of Paul. Christ does not remain dead. He is raised from the dead. What effect then has that on Christ's relation to Law and Sin? Suppose that some great general of the German army was put to death by the command of the Kaiser and buried. But the United States had a man who with skill unequaled went there and resuscitated the dead man and gave him health and strength again. To whom does he now owe allegiance? Germany or the United States? Paul would say: "In that he died, he died unto the Kaiser once for all; but in that he liveth, he liveth

unto the United States." So he says that "Christ, who has died unto Sin, liveth unto God."

But when Sin and Death fought out the conflict with Christ, it was as when David fought out the battle with Goliath. He fought as the representative of mankind. His victory was their victory. This is Paul's thought in 1 Corinthians 15 when, after having told of the coming resurrection of the dead, he cries out in triumph, "O Grave, where is thy victory?" When Christ was raised, the initial victory of God over Death and Sin was gained.

Now in this place, having the same idea in mind, he says, "If we died with Christ, and were with him buried (as our baptism portrayed), we believe that we shall live again as he did." Such being the case, "let not Sin therefore reign in your mortal bodies . . . for Sin shall not have dominion over you." "Seeing that you were emancipated from Sin you became servants of righteousness." It is not that you were set free from all restraint. You are only freed from a cruel master to become the servants of a kind and holy one. Whereas in your former condition you had only death for your wages, in the service of this new Master, who died to obtain you, you have your fruit unto righteousness, and the end everlasting life, which is "the free gift of God."

Thus, while Paul was only seeking to refute an error, we have the gospel indirectly shown in a new way. Christ is the one who having become

our fellow sinner and example, died. We who are united with him by faith share his death and his victory over death, and should like him live unto God. In Paul's view the death of Christ was not, as some say, a mere accident of his mission, nor was it, as others say, simply the natural result of preaching righteousness to an unrighteous generation; but it was a part of a predetermined plan having for its outcome the loyalty of believers to God. As Paul wrote to the Corinthian church, "He died for all, in order that they that live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him that died for them" (2 Cor. 5 : 15).

As a conclusion from his reasoning he says, "*Therefore reckon yourselves as dead unto Sin.*" That is, think of yourselves as now having no further relations to the tyrant Sin. You used to present your members to him for his service. Do so no longer, but, on the contrary, present them unto God for his service.

After this somewhat careful study of the complex passage let us come to consider its practical value.

I notice first the peculiar advantage of thinking about the Christian system of teaching in this pantomimic and personified way. It is imaginative. It may not be taken as either philosophic or theological in form. To do that is to involve us in unthinkable situations. But if we take it to be—which it evidently is—a way of presenting truth so as

to make it vivid and impressive, it is rich in meaning and effect. It would be difficult to state the subtle and mystical facts about the case more understandably than by these methods of expression. They take hold of the imagination and the memory at once and never let go. All inner experiences are dependent for their expression upon things that are outer. Jesus could not give his teaching without the parables and metaphors. And these doctrinal truths demand some concrete framework to give them power and stability.

But what are the truths from this passage that are worth transplanting? The first, I should say, is, "*Reckon yourselves to be dead to Sin.*"

There is a great fund of practical wisdom in that exhortation. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he," says the old proverb. All the great actions of moral life are first enacted in the mind. Having been rehearsed there, they are comparatively easy of performance in life. A boy of my acquaintance was arrested for stabbing his playmate. I went to talk with him in the prison. I found that he was accustomed to read with avidity all the murder news of the daily papers. He had come to "reckon himself" as a brave man ready to kill his enemies.

In traveling, many of us have learned to set aside a liberal amount of money for the journey, and then we have no unpleasant streaks of economy as we are called upon to pay the various charges on

the way. We consecrated the whole amount before we started. We *"reckoned"* it already spent. Mr. Froude, in his history of England, tells how Sir Thomas More, when he was summoned to come from his home in Chelsea to London to take an oath of acknowledgment of the supremacy of the king of England over the church of England, parted with his family and went to his boat that was to take him to London. Before giving the boatman the signal to start he sat down in the boat with his arms folded for a while. He was deciding whether to yield or not. He knew that if he did not yield to the king, he would never return to his home. After a few minutes he started up and said, *"I thank our Lord, the field is won."* He then and there "reckoned himself dead" under the law of England. There was no more struggle about the case. He refused to take the oath of submission. He was imprisoned for two years in the Tower, then taken to the block and beheaded. The historian says of him: "His execution was the world's wonder . . . for the preternatural composure with which it was borne . . . Never was a Christian's victory more grandly evidenced than in that last scene lighted with its lambent humor." [3]

What we think of ourselves is always an important factor in what we make of ourselves. If a man thinks he is a nobody, he is more than half sure to be such an one. If he has a great respect for himself,

[3] Froude's "England," vol. II, p. 376.

quite likely he will become one whom others will respect. The soldier who thinks of himself, not as a mere individual, but as a representative of American honor and courage, is already greatly fortified against the allurements of army life.

Paul drafts this psychological fact into service: "Reckon yourselves" as having died to Sin. Think of yourselves as having forfeited all hopes based upon your individual merit. Label yourself as one who, without Christ, is condemned. But do not stop there. "Reckon yourself" also as alive unto God. Decide each question of duty as one who owes no allegiance except to God. This attitude of mind will be your great defense against almost every species of temptation.

Of all the subtle temptations that come to the churches or the individuals, that is the worst which says: "You cannot succeed because you are a sinner from of old. You must wait on the second coming of Jesus to deliver you from Sin. Bear it with patience as inevitable." Such is not the tone of this letter. "Sin shall not have dominion over you. He may bother you, he may tempt you; but you are not his servant, and he is not your master. Live and continue to live in newness of life and in enjoyment of daily victories over Sin." Such is the counsel of Paul in this chapter.

And the truth to preserve is, "*Know ye not that his servants ye are whom ye obey?*"

Probably every one knows what it is to half

think, "Well, I can do this evil thing, or cherish this wrong feeling, or say this unkind word, and it will be forgiven me because Christ is a forgiving, gracious Lord." The fact is that we all need to be brought up sharp with a round turn when we have such suggestions. "Know ye not," says Paul, "that his servants ye are whom ye obey, whether of Sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" Every time we submit to an evil prompting of the "old man of sin" we are for that time, and to that degree, servants of Sin. And Jesus said we cannot serve two masters. We may stumble; we do make mistakes; we often lack strength to do; but to *allow* ourselves to do wrong is to reenlist under the old master, and to nullify our sacrament of baptism, and to break away from the one whom we have undertaken to serve.

Again we are asked to compare the results of the former way of life with the Christian way. "*When ye were servants of sin, what fruit had ye? . . The end of those things is death.*" Memory tells us that all which we obtain by sinful deeds or words or thoughts, passes away and leaves us no permanent good. We watch the outgoing of those who have lived unto themselves in fleshly pleasures, and see that they have to anticipate only death, without hope. Surely the "*wages of sin is death.*"

But, on the other hand, the gift of God to those that, because of having through Christ Jesus died to Sin, have been raised with Christ, is eternal life.

CHAPTER X

THE BRIDGE FROM A GOOD THEOLOGY TO A BETTER ONE

"Having died to that wherein ye were held."—Rom. 7 : 6.

THOSE who have become acquainted with Jewish people know how tenaciously they cling to the religious ideas in which they are brought up. It is a rare thing to find a Jew who has become a Christian believer. In Brooklyn, N. Y., there is a section in which sixty thousand Jews live. A Christian missionary has worked among them many years. He has distributed the New Testament, translated into their language, among them in large numbers. They hear him preach. Some of them admit they like the gospel teaching; but few break away from their Jewish church. Paul found that same sort of faithfulness to their national religion among the Jews in Rome.

And no wonder; for while the ethical life he taught them was outwardly not much different from theirs, inwardly it was almost the opposite. The fundamental ideas were in part even contradictory. They "worked" for salvation; he taught it was a gift. They thought ceremonial sacrifices were necessary; he taught that these were all done away.

They believed that the race of Israel had special privileges; he taught that the wall of partition was broken down, and that all who had faith were children of Abraham. They thought Jerusalem was the place where the truest worship was to be made; he taught that it made no difference. One can scarcely imagine a more radical change than for a consistent Jew to become a hearty, thoroughgoing Christian.

And the reason was not a reproach to the Jew. He clung to the "law" because he thought it was a God-given law binding upon him.

This section of the letter takes up that phase of their difficulty. Paul does not condemn them as wrong in intention, but he seeks to give them reason for changing—to bridge over their difficulties—to bridge the way for them to accept his teaching, and not condemn what both he and they understood to have been a God-given law.

His "bridge" is this: "*Under God's appointment you are released from the old régime in order to share in the new one.* There is no imputation of evil intent on your part in the old relations and the old theological views; but they were temporary and incomplete. Better things are now being offered to you."

Then, as an illustration of the principle to which he appeals, he says: "In your laws it is provided that while a husband lives the wife is bound to him; but if he dies she is at liberty to marry again. The

legal dissolution of the old bond carries with it the right to enter a new one." [1]

The wife in this figure represents the Christian convert from the Jewish faith. The law of marriage represents the obligation of the Jew to be faithful to his church and God. But now the obligation to the "law" is dissolved because under the figure that he has just been using the law has ceased to have any force, for the Jewish convert has "in Christ" been put to death, and the law therefore has no further relation to him.

While the old covenant was valid, Jews were bound by it; now they are at liberty to accept the Christian faith, not as an antagonistic one, but as a legitimate successor appointed by the Lord.

If they accept Christ, they are not to think of themselves as spiritual adulterers, but as belonging to the faithful and honorable "Bride of Christ," united to him under the blessing of God in bonds never to be broken.

Although this piece of argument in its actual form has no application to us Gentiles, it involves a principle that has to-day a great value and wide application. There are many people now who have

[1] The illustration Paul uses here is not carried out fully. He appears to confuse himself; for while in the first part he speaks of the husband's death, in the latter part he speaks of the woman being dead to the law. One is likely to ask why he did not say: "The man is bound to the wife as long as she lives," and then continue: "Since the law is now done away with, he is at liberty to marry again." I take it that he could not use the figure in that way because at that time it was not true that a man was bound to the woman as long as she lived. Under the law of that time he was at liberty to divorce or to have two wives. Hence he could only use the figure in connection with the woman.

been brought up in, or have for themselves come to have very great faith in, some particular church or some particular theory of religion. For a time it was satisfactory to them. But now they have seen a new light. The old view fails to meet their needs. And yet they have been committed to it long and sincerely. It looks to them like turning traitor to friends and God to accept some other view. But there is an inner sense of desire to be fully committed to a larger (as they think) and better conception of life and its relations.[2]

To such Paul's argument has a value. It is a "bridge" for them to pass over to new views without doing violence to their sense of honor or of duty. If God has unmistakably shown a new way to be his way, it implies that the obligation to the old is dissolved. I suppose that every one would feel justified if he knew that it was God's will for him to pass from any view into a newer one. But the difficulty lies in obtaining the will of God on the subject.

I think we may find light on this matter if we consider for a little the possible channels through which we may expect to receive the divine instruction.

Suppose, for example, that we know by study that a certain mathematical process will give us accurate and correct results on a problem in engineering.

[2] Recent books like "The Inside of the Cup," "The Soul of a Bishop," "The Invisible King," reveal a great questioning about important matters.

It has been tried by others, and we have tried it ourselves and found it correct. Would it be any more satisfactory if we had seen it written on the sky some evening?

Or suppose that it has been demonstrated beyond question that a certain medicine is a specific for chills and fever; thousands have tried it with curative results. Would it be any more satisfactory or effective if we had found the prescription in the Bible?

Certain regulations about food and water and air are unmistakably demonstrated to be sane and safe. Would they be any more authoritative if they were carved in stone by the finger of God and set up at every crossroad?

If a man accustomed to any kind of medical treatment found that a different one was equally or more effective, would he feel bound to the old? A physician who objects to improved methods and new medicines is at once discounted as being narrow and second class.

We all agree that in any of these and many thousands of other similar cases nothing would be a surer test than being true to the facts.

But is not the same reasoning forceful in the realm of ideas as well as in the realm of the physical? Suppose for example that a man has held to the sanctity of the Bible because he thought it was all written by men whose hands were directed by angelic hands, so that in every sentence we have

not only the "word" of God but the "words" of God. He has held that view and has sought to conform his conduct and his hopes to what those angel hands had written for his instruction. But more careful study of the facts makes it certain to him that different men wrote, not as they were directed by angels, but as they were "moved by the Spirit of God." How is he to know which view to take? Does he not say that he must follow the truth as he has been able to see it? And if he is satisfied that his later view is true is he not as comfortable under it as if he had heard a voice from heaven telling him of it? And is he not as faithful to God as he was before he made the discovery that angels did not hold the writers' hands?

A great part of our conduct is regulated by certain ideas we have about the teaching of the Bible. Suppose that after years of belief in the duty of parents to baptize their children, it becomes evident to us that such a ceremony is not called for, are we as much bound now to omit it as we were formerly bound to have it observed?

Suppose that a man has been accustomed to follow Mr. Beecher's teaching and thinks he was a more safe leader than Bishop Joyce or Cardinal Farley, is he not as much at liberty to follow him as the converts of Paul were to follow him instead of Gamaliel; and if a man has followed Calvin, may he not become a disciple of some other teacher?

I think Paul's principle would say to him, "If

God has shown you a new way as plainly as he showed you the earlier one, you are not only at liberty to follow it, but you ought to follow it."

All this rests, however, on the idea that the TRUTH is God's voice. In that way he makes his will known. If in any department of life or of thinking we can know the TRUTH, we know the will of God. Jesus said, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." We who would know God's will must seek the TRUTH, and when we find it, we are not "spiritual adulterers" if we embrace it and follow it boldly.

But to say this is not to say that we are to drop every idea we do not fully understand and take up with everything that looks like truth. It becomes us to be very careful not to follow "every wind of doctrine" that blows across the plain; nor follow every will-o'-the-wisp that comes along with a glib tongue and a sweet voice. It becomes us to weigh carefully and judge fairly. But when we have done that and are convinced that we have a truth, then we are at liberty to accept it, confess it, and live by it, no matter what others may say about our disloyalty. "We are dead to that wherein we were held."

I would notice, however, that this is not dishonoring what was the truth to us in earlier days. It is true in every department of life that men make progress. We all do as Paul did. When he was a child, he spoke as a child, he thought as a child.

When he was a Jewish student under Gamaliel, he thought as a Jewish student. But when he saw Jesus in a new light, he followed the new light as faithfully as he had followed the earlier dawn of truth. We are taught to grow in grace and in the knowledge of God. But we cannot grow unless we acquire new ideas. That is, they are new to us. We are only gaining a fuller view of Truth than we had before. It is impossible for us to make any advance if we feel bound so closely to the earlier ideas that we feel guilty to leave them behind and take up larger ones. If the Jews had been thus bound, they could never have admitted the Gentile converts into their fellowship. Peter at one time felt bound thus; but Paul "withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed" (Gal. 2 : 11-13). If Paul had felt thus bound we should have had no apostle Paul. He would have said to the vision he had on the way to Damascus: "I cannot be disloyal to my old views. The old ceremonial law was God-given, I must not discard it."

If Luther had not found this "bridge," he would have remained in the Roman Catholic Church, and the Reformation would not have been effected in his vicinity. If William Tyndale had not found it, we should have had our Bible in no language but poor Latin, and that in the hands of poorer priests. If Knox and Cromwell had not found it, we should to-day be under state church autocracy which damns Germany and the world. All the people of the

Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches owe their positions in the religious world to the exercise by their early leaders of the right to cross this "bridge" from old views of long standing and great excellence in many respects to new ones of better excellence.

Our only serious question must be, "Does God sound the advance?" And when we listen for the reply we hear only this: "God is TRUTH and TRUTH is God's voice. Therefore seek the TRUTH with courage." That is the "bridge" from our earlier position to maturer and wiser ones. When TRUTH beckons, take her hand and cross the "bridge."

I am sure some one may say: "This is a subtle way of inoculating readers with new theology or what has been called with great disgust German theology. It is a species of spiritual adultery itself."

But I must protest that I have no new theology and no old theology to present at this time. What I would like to do is to have men see that there is no life and no growth in grace unless we are at liberty to be married to a new truth when we see it to be such.

It will not be considered a strange statement if we say that the Christian world to-day is far better informed about the meaning and the value of Jesus' teaching than the first disciples were. We read how in the very first years of the gospel the Jewish converts were only half brought over to the Chris-

tian position. James said to Paul when he came to Jerusalem, "You see, brother, how many thousands of the Jews have believed, and they are all very zealous for the law" (Acts 21 : 20). Yet it is the same law that here in Romans Paul says the Christians are freed from. (So also in Gal. 5 : 1.) All those people to whom the letter to Hebrews was sent, or for whom it was written, were held in a strong bond to the temple at Jerusalem. Unless they had felt at liberty to leave that behind they would have remained in a narrow view of things.

If we go back to the Old Testament times we find the prophets, who were the real deliverers of Israel, were counted as heretical and unsafe. Amos was against the dead formalism of Israel. Malachi was against the priests. (Mal. 2.) And this not because either priest or people was intentionally wrong but because a narrow and blind devotion to things-as-they-used-to-be prevented them from seeing things-that-might-be with advantage.

Jesus was the arch-enemy of religion if the Pharisees were to be taken as judges. Yet he was only leading men's minds out to larger things.

So it seems to me we are to claim liberty to think, and liberty to learn. I do not say liberty to make oneself foolish; nor liberty to exchange well-tried truths for crude speculations; but liberty to learn TRUTH; then courage to confess TRUTH and follow it. When some man broaches a view that is

new we may not wisely call him disloyal to the King, but we may ask him for his reasons. If they are good we may join him in the blessing of it.

But some one may say: "We have the Bible as the standard of Truth. We cannot invent new ideas or discard any that the Bible contains. No one is at liberty to depart from that." Suppose we admit the full force of that statement; then we are brought to the place where we must inquire what the teaching of the Bible is. Here is a man, for example, who has sincerely believed that the world will get better and better until all the nations have as a whole come to honor Jesus and to walk in his ways. But after a time of study, and after reading some of the books of men, he is sincerely convinced that he has seen only a part of the truth; he has been like the man to whom Jesus gave sight—at first he saw "men as trees walking," now he thinks he sees clearly. And he is certain that evil is to corrupt the church and the world until Christ comes and reigns on earth for a thousand years, and then the earth that now is will be destroyed by fire, and a new earth on a better plan will be established. Suppose, let us say, that he is sincerely convinced that such is the truth; then he must have liberty to think so, and to conform his action to his thought. He must also take the risk of having his building perish like "hay, wood, and stubble," or being like gold tried in the fire. (1 Cor. 3 : 10-15.)

But the crucial thing is that in determining what the Bible teaches he seeks the TRUTH. And in seeking it he must use his own judgment. That judgment is human at best. He may therefore fall into conclusions about the teachings of the Bible that are not correct conclusions. Being only human judgments they are not assuredly infallible. A curious instance of this is found in the reasoning about the depravity of man. It was said that, being depraved in all his being, his reason is not safe to follow. Therefore men valiantly defended the doctrine of depravity and condemned the conclusions of human reason as unsound of a necessity. But they overlooked the fact that their own reason, in so concluding, was unreliable, and being itself depraved its conclusions about depravity might be wrong.

So we conclude that in many things, in which experience is not able to decide which is correct, we can only give liberty, and take liberty to think and act; being careful not to underestimate the testimony borne by the church through ages of trial in the furnace of life to the great fundamental facts and principles of the common Christian faith, namely: Christ Jesus the authoritative representative of God; who came to earth; took our form; and as such died; was buried; raised from the dead; now sitteth on high; to whom it is the part of wisdom and duty to commit ourselves as our Teacher, Guide, and Saviour, in full confidence that

those who thus commit themselves will be given a resurrection like unto his and will be with him in a future world that is to be revealed in due season.

Being, for good reasons, released from allegiance to any other views we are free (using the figure of Paul) to be "joined to another and bring forth fruit unto God."

CHAPTER XI

A VICTORIOUS DEFEAT

"I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord."—Rom. 7 : 25.

THIS seventh chapter is a notable one; a field of many great discussions and small agreements. In the section included between the fourteenth and the twenty-fifth verses the discussions have been especially earnest. Paul is describing a serious religious experience of some one; and the inquiring have been asking, Who is the some one? Is it Paul's own spiritual biography used to illustrate and explain his teaching? Or is it a supposed case introduced to throw light on his teaching? And if it be either one or the other, does it relate the experiences of a man "regenerate" or "unregenerate"? If we say "regenerate," are we satisfied to say that such an one is "miserable" and "wretched" as in verse 24? If we say "unregenerate," how shall we account for his saying, as in verse 25, that he serves the law of God with his mind, but that with the flesh he is servant to the law of sin?

While these are interesting questions for the student of religious psychology, I shall pass by them

that we may consider rather the helpful message of the section.

First, let us get a perspective of the passage. He says, "I am carnal, sold under sin," like a slave bought at the auction block, by a master unrelenting and strong. I battle for liberty, but I am always defeated. I despair of getting my liberty. The chains of this living death seem to be riveted on. Wretched man that I am! Who can deliver me from the bondage? Then, as if he saw some strong deliverer come to his rescue, he bursts out with the text, "I thank God through Christ Jesus our Lord."

The apostle introduces this illustration because he rightly assumes that it is the experience of all serious-minded people to have a similar battle, and he would lead them to have a similar victory.

But it is of importance to note the origin of the battle. He says, I was "alive once without the law." That is, there was a time when he was not having a battle. He felt secure. No evil threatened him. But when the "law came" he died. I take it that he means when he came to see what the law of God really demanded, then he saw how much he lacked, and then his battle began. For he knew the outward requirements of the law from his youth, but its inner demands he had not seen.

There are some of those who read this that do not see that his words are suitable to their condition. And there is no suitableness—now. There

was a time when much that is here said was not suitable for Paul himself. Until he was awakened to the high demands of God, he was not conscious of any great deficiency in himself. A young man once said to me as I spoke to him about his religious needs, "Really I do not need the gospel." It is not until one has begun a serious attempt to be thoroughly good in deed and thought that these sayings have much pertinency. When the conditions arrive they will be suitable.

There are four stages in this biography:

First, the battle. When a man begins seeking to be "right with God" his battle starts. We all know what it is to be more or less conscious at times of being a sort of citadel which is being besieged by two distinct and opposing parties. We seem to stand between the two, and are called upon to decide which shall have possession of us. This is not a conception born in Jewish training, nor is it a dogma of theology; it is simply a psychological fact.

In recent years many books have been published dealing with the psychology of religion.[1] The central fact in them all is the recognition of what one has called "the divided self." No matter how well we have been brought up, nor how solidly established our habits have become, every

[1] Such as James, "Psychology of Religious Experience," and "The Will to Believe"; Cutten, "Psychological Phenomena of Christianity"; Pratt, "Psychology of Religious Belief"; Davenport, "Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals"; Coe, "Religion of a Mature Man."

little while we find the other kind of habits trying to break into our lives. Even when we think we have permanently mastered one set of tendencies so that we can keep our acts and words in line with our ideal, we come to see that there remain in the heart, like the old habits of thought which immigrants retain after they have learned the ways of a new country and have become loyal citizens under its government, motives and susceptibilities that we are ashamed of. They lie dormant much of the time, but on occasion they spring up like ambushed Indians to take us prisoners. Then the injunction, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall," finds an application to us.

The New England Primer—the book on which for one hundred and fifty years the children of New England were religiously nourished—had in it a dialogue supposedly between a youth and Jesus and Satan. Satan says among other things:

> If thou wilt but be ruled by me,
> An artist thou shalt quickly be;
> In all my ways which lovely are
> They're few with thee who shall compare.

Then Christ is represented as making his plea for the youth's life:

> Wilt thou, O youth, make such a choice,
> And thus obey the Devil's voice?
> Curst sinful ways wilt thou embrace,
> And hate the ways of truth and grace?

The youth replies:

> Thy ways, O Christ, are not for me;
> They with my age do not agree.

Then, after another plea by Christ, the youth replies:

> Amazed, Lord, I now begin.
> Oh help me, and I'll leave my sin.

This quaint, and in some ways disagreeable, form of presenting it does after all put the truth in story fashion that every one of us has the choice to make between two strange and dissonant elements that press us to accept their supremacy in our lives. At times these "voices" seem to be distinctly from some one outside the inner chamber of our souls. At other times they seem to be hardly distinguishable from ourselves. Sometimes we are surprised and ashamed to find springing up from within thoughts and ambitions and semimotives that would make us despise others if we knew they had such.[2]

We battle with tendencies to do unethical acts; but these tendencies are by no means the most troublesome. We find an unreadiness to accept fully the teachings of Jesus. We ask "why" to everything he counseled us to do. Objections arise to almost every requirement of duty to God or man. Agnosticism puts in its protest against almost all

[2] Bunyan.

the positive ideas of religion. A thinking man is obliged to reason away unreasonable things. We fight dispositions that are unduly sensitive, and are always watching for slights. Personal pride makes us unhappy when we are criticized. A spirit of independence holds us back from admitting that we are dependent on Christ. We face a dislike to the whole doctrine of grace. Fear of poverty disputes with charity. Greed of gain struggles against missionary duty. The deceitfulness of riches and the cares of the world choke the good seed of the word until it brings no fruit to perfection. It is not against flesh and blood that our battle is fought but against spiritual wickednesses.

The voice of Christian fellowship calls to us, and it is drowned by the claims of denominational feeling. We desire the approval of others, but loyalty to truth calls on us to scorn their approval. Love of pleasure would lead us to underestimate the value of usefulness and sacrifice. A whole phalanx of things attack us from both sides, each seeking to gain control of the "I myself." If one had eyes to visualize the heart of man, he would see it as a kind of battle-field in which the tide of victory swings now one way and now the other, each important point being fought for over and over again.

The universality of such a conflict is witnessed by the hymns we sing and the prayers we unitedly utter.

Rev. George Heath crystallized and immortalized our common warning in the hymn:

My soul, be on thy guard;
Ten thousand foes arise;
The hosts of sin are pressing hard
To draw thee from the skies.

O watch and fight and pray;
The battle ne'er give o'er;
Renew it boldly every day,
And help divine implore.

In the General Confession of the Church we read:

Almighty and most merciful Father; We have erred, and strayed from thy ways like lost sheep. We have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts.

And in the Litany we join again and again in the prayer:

From all blindness of heart; from pride, vainglory, and hypocrisy; from envy, hatred, and malice, and all uncharitableness,
Good Lord, deliver us.

From all inordinate and sinful affections; and from all the deceits of the world, the flesh, and the devil,
Good Lord, deliver us.

From all false doctrine, heresy, and schism; from hardness of heart, and contempt of thy Word and Commandment,
Good Lord, deliver us.

All these bear witness to the time-long struggle of evil and good so much within us that we sometimes think we are only the prize for which they contend rather than a party interested in the contention.

Secondly, the defeat. "I find a law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members. . . The good which I would, I do not; and the evil which I would not, that I practise." If we were not thoughtful we should say that Paul accused himself either unjustly or insincerely. But when we delay our speech while we take a look into the depths of our own hearts, we are made to see that his story is our story. Who is the man that can say he carries out all his resolutions for good? The failure is so universal that "New Year's resolution" has come to be a synonym for short-lived success, that lasts over a sunrise or two, and then goes to the waste of life. Some day when health is good, and the sun is bright, and the surroundings favorable, we seem to have made a good success. But as soon as the sun goes down and the darkness comes on, a careful inspection of the day's life shows marks and scars and blemishes that despoil us of our comfort. "In the practical life of the individual, we know how his whole gloom or glee about any fact depends on the remoter schemes and hopes with which it stands related. Let it be known to lead nowhere, and

however it may be in its immediacy, its glow and gilding vanish." [3] Luther said to a friend who had wished him long life, "Rather than live forty years I would give up my chance of Paradise." Louis Stevenson, the most confirmed and persistent optimist of his day, whose writings at times contain the very elixir of hope, said: "Whatever else we are intended to do, we are not intended to succeed. Failure is the fate allotted; our business is not to continue to fail in good spirits."

The Preacher of Ecclesiastes said repeatedly, "All is vanity and vexation of spirit."

The man regarded by the world as the happiest man has the inmost consciousness that he has not attained his aim in holy living, that the goal still beckons him from far ahead.

We need not to make any argument to others or to ourselves to bring us into an understanding of this phase of the battle. We know that by the works of law of any kind neither ourselves nor others are justified. We all come short. The good in us is defeated.

Thirdly, the despair. Paul says, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me?" And his thought is that on the basis of his own doings or merit he cannot find a deliverer.

We must not forget here that he is trying to teach, and in doing so he is supposing a case. That is, he is neither telling his own actual condition at

[3] James, "Varieties of Religious Experience," p. 148.

that time, nor exactly his condition at any other time. He is practically saying, "If I were to think that my justification, that is my standing before God, is dependent on my own merit—my own actual keeping of any law—I should be obliged to say, O wretched man." And his idea is that any man then or now that rests his hope on his own actual goodness rests it on a foundation of sand. And there is for him no other foundation. Of course Paul knew that at the time he wrote, but he states the case of a man who might try to stand on that legal basis or who might—as it was called in another letter—"fall from grace" and land on the lower platform of law.

Probably few now feel the poignancy of that despair as he did or as some have since then. The days of camp-meeting experiences are not now upon us. But the most self-examining ones among us in the calmest moments of self-scrutiny can have no hope for any peace if they look for it in themselves alone. "This sadness lies at the heart not merely of every positivistic, agnostic, or naturalistic scheme of philosophy. Naturalism fed on cosmological speculations puts men in the position of people living on a frozen lake, surrounded by impassable cliffs, and yet knowing that little by little the ice is melting and the inevitable day drawing near when the last film will disappear and they all be drowned." [4]

[4] Professor James.

Fourthly, the victory. "I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Paul now turns to the relief that the gospel gives to men such as he has been describing. And this is the jewel of the text. Out of all the despair, whether great or little, the message of Christ brings us rejoicing. To all that labor and are heavy-laden Christ offers rest of soul if they will commit themselves to him.

This is the *victory of defeat.* If the hopeless struggle to be flawless in oneself does actually lead men to a faith in Christ such that not only are their relations to God set right, but a new power is introduced into life that gives them a gradual but surely gaining saintliness; and if that faith could not have been gained in any other way than the despair by which it was brought, it is a victory indeed.

The theory of Paul—and the facts of life confirm it—is that until men are rendered hopeless in themselves they will not value the gospel of Christ; and therefore the law came in that sin might abound. But where sin abounded grace did superabound. The whole scheme of salvation was by him conceived as a well-formulated scheme to bring men into those relations to their Father in heaven which would be joyous and of the family sort; that we might be "bound with golden chains around the throne of God," or as Zinzendorf said, "be chained to the chariot of Christ with chains of love." Or as a philosopher has said, "These experiences may be after all the best key to life's sig-

nificance, and possibly the only opener of our eyes to the deepest levels of truth." [5]

Certain it is that we all lack the motive power to do what we know we ought to do. And we have thoughts and emotions that we know we ought not to have. But we are powerless to change the fountain out of which they come. If our wills can be reenforced by something, and if some resolvent of evil can be gotten into our hearts, we shall be able to do, and to think, and to feel as we ought. What the gospel of God does is to make us indebted to him for his grace and to Christ for his love; and thus gratitude and affection are made to reenforce our wills and change our hearts. It is this entirely reasonable view that in the last analysis of reflection justifies the way of the gospel, and the system of salvation by grace, and it is this which inspires the universal hymn:

O, to grace how great a debtor
Daily I'm constrained to be!
Let thy grace, Lord, like a fetter,
Bind my wandering heart to thee.
Prone to wander, Lord, I feel it;
Prone to leave the God I love;
Here's my heart; Lord, take and seal it;
Seal it for thy courts above.

[5] Professor James.

CHAPTER XII

THE NORMAL WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE CHRISTIAN

HENRY WARD BEECHER once said of the eighth chapter of Romans: "It is the greatest feat of moral philosophy that has ever been performed in this world. It is deeper, more comprehensive, and therefore more difficult in the form in which it stands than any other part of the Scriptures. Its difficulties arise from the number and importance of the truths which pour into it; for like the Amazon it drains a continent, and every drop that falls upon the farthest mountain or along the valleys finds its way hither. So I might say the Bible forms a watershed on either side, and that it all runs into the eighth chapter of Romans."

There is much in the chapter to warrant this description of it. But Mr. Beecher found much of his difficulty because of a misconception he had of the whole drift of the apostle's thought. He attempts to read the chapter as if only two elements were involved in it; one which he calls the "animal nature"—"his animal appetites and passions"—and the other which he calls the "higher nature," "by which he becomes a son of God." This conception will not harmonize with the language of the

chapter, because it does not harmonize with Paul's underlying thought.

There are in the chapter, not two, but three elements or agencies; those which Mr. Beecher mentions, and a third most important one, namely, the Spirit of God—the Spirit of life.

Whether we can identify in ourselves the workings of this third agency or not, we cannot read the apostle's words with any understanding unless we have this third agency in mind.

I desire to pass by other themes that lie near the surface of the chapter and to try to transplant some of the leading ideas about this Spirit of God as it operates in the Christian life.

And first, we need to get some fairly clear idea about this Spirit of God. It is not an easy thing to do so. John said that as the wind bloweth, and we cannot tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth, so is every one that is born of the Spirit. But I think we can all remember times when we seemed to be acted upon by something in us but not of us—an unsought sense of our own sin; or a new and clearer idea of the goodness of God; or a strange modification in our hearts of our feelings toward people whom we had not liked; or an unwonted peace of heart in the midst of trial or sorrow. These experiences are such that we can only account for them by assigning them to an intelligent and kindly Some One acting in us for our good. That agency is the Spirit of God.

This chapter deals with the Christian life as it is lived under the influence of that divine Spirit—that Spirit of life.

Let us consider what its activities are. At the end of chapter six it was written that we are emancipated from Sin and become servants to God, and have in his service the *gift* of eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. The next chapter is given to answering some queries that might arise (ver. 7, 13); and at the end of that section he says that one who tries to work out his own justification finds a law within his members so strong that he is constantly brought into captivity to the law of Sin. (Ver. 23.) This is so common with him that in his despair he cries out, "Who shall deliver me from this body of death?" Then recalling the gospel message, its plans and provisions, he answers his question, saying, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Now in this eighth chapter he returns to the thought at the close of the sixth, and says, "Therefore there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." That is, the law of Sin, the tyrannical master they have been under, can now work no sort of condemnation to them. And for this reason, namely: those who are by an earnest faith "in Christ," have the Spirit-of-life—that is, the life-giving Spirit—given them from God, and that Spirit sets them free from the law of Sin.

This freedom has two aspects. One is, that it

changes the régime under which men are to live if they are "in Christ," so that they are measured by a new standard. The old way having failed, a new way has been presented, and they are thus set free from the old one.

But the other aspect is that by the reenforcement of their own spirits by the "Spirit-of-life" they are able to win in the struggle against Sin. This aspect is expressed by some as if the passage read, "The *power* of the Spirit-of-life has set us free from the *power* of Sin." The passage has been discussed very earnestly; some taking it as only theoretically, potentially, ideally true, others insisting that it is actually true that the Spirit-of-life, not only in theory but in fact, gives actual freedom from Sin.

I can but think that both are true. The first certainly is; and that would not have any value if the other were not its culmination.

I find, then, the one great truth which we are entitled to keep for ourselves is that the *Spirit-of-life will give us daily lives triumphant over the tyrant Sin.*

And that this is not a mere "minister's theory" is evidenced by the men and women who are living witnesses of its actuality. Many former drunkards, now sober, are unmistakable walking testimonies to the power of this Spirit-of-life to free men from the drink habit and power. The John Bunyans, the John Newtons, the John B. Goughs, the Colonel

Hadleys, the Francis Murphys, the Professor Gilmores, the long line of men who march in the columns of the Salvation Army—all join in a triumphant chorus that says:

Sought by thy mercy, Lord,
Saved by thy power,
Led by thy gracious hand,
Kept every hour.
Thine shall the honor be,
Thine evermore;
Thy name we glorify,
Thy name adore.

If there were no other testimony than that of the victors over the rum power in this "body of sin" it would decide the value of this Spirit-of-life.

Listen to the noisy profanity and vulgarity that flows from the company of worldlings, and note how it ceases when the Spirit of God takes possession. Every profane man become prayerful is a star witness to the emancipating power of this Spirit.

And here is a company of men changed from selfish, greedy, penurious, unhappy men into unselfish, generous, rejoicing supporters of the missionary and the charitable work of their communities. Summon them all, and let them tell the secret of their change. They will say, "It came when we committed ourselves to Christ."

In looking over a whole community, if we see a margin of good in one over that of another we find

it is due to the average lives of the Christian believers there, and that is due to this Spirit-of-life imparted to them and working in them in response to their faith in Christ Jesus.

Outside of that circle the old struggle remains. The sense of doing what one does not approve, the weary, daily consciousness that the Law of Sin is master of the field, that he has only been driven back to the "old Hindenburg line," and there defies us. There is no victory until the "Great Ally" comes into the conflict.

There is a great exhortation and a great word of hope for each of you who is struggling alone, seeking righteousness perhaps with a real zeal, but subject nevertheless to daily defeat; this says you can come in as conquerors; it is within your reach to say: "Thanks be to God through Christ Jesus our Lord that he has given me victory to-day over a temper that has been my master: he has lessened the demands of my fleshly appetites and passions, and helped me to harness them into a good service; he has given me a better vision of my fellow men so that I have taken pleasure in doing them good; life has been worth living to-day;

Lord, if I may I'll serve another day."

We have seen the trees stripped of their leaves by the frosts and storms, the fields whitened with the winter's snow, the brooks frozen up so they did not sing, all the life and joy seemingly gone.

But the spring suns, the warm rains, change the face of Nature; earth puts on her robes of living green; the brooks begin to sing again; and the birds respond with their love-songs. No more wonderful change can be imagined than that from December to June. This is a likeness of the change that comes over the moral world when the gospel comes in its power. The fear of God gives place to the cry, "Our Father"; bitterness yields to love; passions make way for peace; new songs are put into men's mouths; new purposes in their hearts; new hopes, new ambitions—all things new.

"They that are after the Spirit do mind the things of the Spirit."

The word "mind" has a great fulness of meaning. It comes from a word that means "to think." It contains the idea of thinking and then aiming at the conclusions of the thinking. To be like-minded with Christ is to have the same aims as he. To be money-minded is to have money-getting the dominant motive in life. The apostle says, "Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate." That was written to guard against the desire to be in what we moderns call "society," whether it be good or bad. "Let that mind be in you, which was in Christ Jesus." That is, regulate your lives by the same dominant motives and aims.

What is here said is that if men are truly committed to Christ, he will give them the aims and motives that are agreeable to the Spirit of God.

We all know how really decisive our inner aims in life are. Our deepest ambitions stand ready all the time to become the decisive factor in decisions; they are the "balance of power" in close issues. If a minister's aim is to be a great scholar he will decide between two pastorates for the one that will give him time for scholarly research or proximity to a university.

If he has an ambition for notoriety, or to become a great orator, he finds this ambition tugging at his heart like a piece of steel on the magnetic needle, influencing his judgment and his tastes. If his chief ambition is to "get a crowd," he almost unconsciously imitates the speech and antics of a Billy Sunday.

A minister said to me one day, "I am just crazy to make money." I noticed that when he got the morning paper he did not, like most readers, turn to the big headlines of the news columns, but at once to the records of the stock-market. Although he knew this was not a suitable ambition he did not seemingly have control of the deeper currents of his own life.

The same is true among all Christians. Their "minds"—that is their deepest aims—determine the course of their lives. And for this reason they are often troubled because they know their ambitions are not of the highest grade.

It seems to me the encouragement of this passage is that if we truly commit ourselves to Christ the

Spirit of God will work a change in the "fontal affections"—in the deepest aims—so that they will be brought into harmony with the right things. We shall find it true that they that are "of the Spirit" will have the "mind of the Spirit" and will aim at such things as are in full harmony with his mind.

And I think it will not be confined to having the same kindness of spirit, but it will include the same breadth of vision. It will lead into what lies behind the expression "Thy kingdom come." It will enlarge the field of sympathy to take in what the Great Commission included. It will give not only the vision and the kindliness but the patient courage also. In no small degree it will give us the estimate of our fellow men that he had, and the same high faith that they can become his disciples.

This may not be expected to come as a miracle of immediate healing. It will come by various means; chiefly through the channel of better views of the truth. In all his works he honors the mental and moral constitutions he has given us.

Another truth contained in the section is that the *Spirit gives us the sense of being "children of God";* witnesses with our spirit that we are such. It is an inner testimony. I once read this as if it was a conclusion of our intelligence. An aged Methodist preacher said to me: "No, friend! It is a direct testimony." As I have studied Scripture more, but especially as I have studied Christian ex-

perience more, I am convinced that the preacher was right. There comes into the heart a conviction that we are the children of God when we cannot and do not try to give a logical reason for the conviction. The Spirit witnesses with our spirit. The testimony of logic will confirm the witness. It certainly will dispute a mistaken testimony. Reason is not dethroned; it is put where it belongs. The fact is that when we have Christ we for the first time are able to join in spirit and in truth in the prayer, "Our Father in heaven." We have then no fear of the throne. We come boldly to the throne of grace. We say from the heart, "Father." In reading the Psalms we notice how far short of the Christian attitude their address to God is. We find him regarded as the Lord many times, as God generally, then as Shepherd, as Strong Tower, as Shield and Buckler, as Deliverer, as King; but nowhere do we find men coming to the throne in prayer as to a Father. It is in the highest moments of our own religious life that we utter that first word of the Lord's Prayer as the instinctive expression of our feelings.[1]

"*He maketh intercession for us according to the will of God.*" We never get beyond the need of prayer. The more we know of the honor conferred upon us, the more we pray to be worthy of it. It is the most saintly who are most prayerful. This prayer is not for victory over sins so much as it is

[1] Maclaren, "The Mind of the Master," chap. XII.

for wisdom and strength to use ourselves to the best advantage. The missionary prays for the people to whom he goes; the pastor, for the people over whom he is placed as the spiritual teacher; the business man, that he may know how to consecrate his talent to the good of the community; the parent, that he may bring up his children as he ought. It is for such things that we feel our insufficiency. And if we knew that we could have, down to the smallest detail, everything we should ask for, it would stop the fountain of prayer at once; for we should be afraid to ask lest we should ask amiss. It is on account of such things that we welcome the promise that the Spirit intercedes for us according to the will of God.

We have sometimes heard children cry. But they could not express their wants in words; nor could we interpret their cries; but the mother knows what is the mind of the child's spirit and responds to it. So I think our heavenly Father understands the groanings that come often from our hearts which are the only available expressions of our desires. When I was a small boy I was intimately associated with a very godly man. I rode much with him, and often slept with him; and it used to be a mystery to me why he often groaned aloud when we were riding along. I knew it was not physical pain, but I did not know how to account for it. Later in life I learned that it was his great spiritual yearnings; for he was a man of such spirit

that he was in prayer for others. Such is what, I conceive, the apostle had in mind. These groanings are not the groans of fear, nor even of repentance, but they are the yearnings of God's Spirit speaking in ours—"God working in us to will and to do"—longings for more wisdom and more power to do good.

The culmination of all these operations of the life-giving Spirit is to be realized in this: "*He that raised up Christ from the dead shall give life also to your mortal bodies, through his Spirit that dwelleth in you.*"

The full meaning of this statement appears only in connection with what has gone before. In verse 10 he has said, "The body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness." Christ makes the spirit righteous by giving us the mind of his Spirit. So that we have a living spirit in a dying body. What he says implies the idea that he will do for the body what he has done for the spirit. He has already given life to the spirit; he will later give life to your bodies also. That is, the redemption will not be completed until the body itself is freed from the death that is upon it because of sin. In verse 23 he says, "We who have received the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, namely, the redemption of the body."

This promised victory over death is the culminating blessing of the Christian life.

Rev. Thomas Armitage, for many years pastor of a large church in New York City, said to me during his last weeks of life: "I have always in preaching tried to get back of the texts to see what was the conception out of which they grew. But I have always been unable to see why the Scriptures speak so lightly of death. It seemed to me that death is the king of terrors. It breaks up our plans; it disappoints our hopes; it separates families; it robs us of friends. But since I have been sick I have come to see that death does not touch with its finger anything that is of value to me."

It may be we are late in seeing this truth. But it is in this text very plainly stated. Paul was strong in faith to say, and we are encouraged by the same Spirit to say:

> Death with thy weapons of war lay me low;
> Strike, King of terrors. I fear not the blow.
> Jesus hath broken the bars of the tomb;
> Joyfully, joyfully, I will go home.

I have been greatly surprised to find some very intelligent people who were troubled about the conditions of the next world. They had the idea that we are to be disembodied, specterlike beings; and they shrink from that. And no wonder. Even the Greeks and the Romans dreaded Hades. It was in their conception a sort of subcellar abode, a region of gloom where neither light nor darkness prevails.

I have been still more surprised to find in literature ideas like Bryant's:

> . . . Yet a few days and thee
> The all-beholding sun shall see no more
> In all his course. Nor yet in the cold ground,
> Where thy pale form was laid with many tears,
> Nor in the embrace of ocean shall exist
> Thy image. Earth that nourished thee, shall claim
> Thy growth to be resolved to earth again.
> And, lost each human trace, surrendering up
> Thine individual being shalt thou go
> To mix forever with the elements.

Whatever others may hope for in the world after this, the Christian has the "blessed hope" of a resurrection. It was this hope for which Paul said he was called in question. (Acts 23 : 6.) It was this which he said is the culmination of all our other hopes, for if Christ be not raised, then we have no hope (1 Cor. 15 : 12-19), but if the Spirit that raised him from the grave to glory, and to honor above every name that is named, dwells in us, it will be an easy matter to put endless and heavenly life into these mortal bodies.

There are questions about the conditions of the new life that are yet unanswered, but that we shall have bodies suited to our new conditions is certain. That they will be as much better than these as the butterfly's body is better than the body of the worm from which it comes, is not unlikely. "It is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know

that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him even as he is" (1 John 3 : 2).

> Alas for him who never sees
> The stars shine through his cypress-trees!
> Who, hopeless, lays his dead away,
> Nor looks to see the breaking day
> Across the mournful marbles play!
> Who hath not learned, in hours of faith,
> The truth to flesh and sense unknown,
> That Life is ever Lord of Death,
> And Love can never lose its own.[2]

[2] Whittier, "Snow-Bound."

CHAPTER XIII

WHAT ABOUT THE JEWS?

"And so all Israel shall be saved."—Rom. 11 : 26.

PAUL'S teaching in the first eight chapters has been a systematic treatment of the divine plan of salvation. He has said it comes only through faith in Christ Jesus. He has told about the excellencies of the plan; he has replied to the erroneous inferences that men might make; and then he has burst forth in that exultant passage: "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8 : 38, 39).

Then he turns his thought toward the Jews. He knew that many of them were in Rome, and that they would hear this letter, or hear about it. They would raise the question: "What about us? You have done away with our ceremonies; you have denied the actual safety even in our good ethical conduct; you have said we are all under condemnation. What about God's word to Israel? Has he forgotten his covenant? Or does he think it

a temporary affair to be set aside at his pleasure?"

In what constitutes in our version chapters 9, 10, 11 of his letter Paul deals with this matter with much care and fulness.

Although it has little or no application to us, it is nevertheless an interesting and important matter. Many people exalt it into almost a vital matter. It has become more closely related to us in America because of the great numbers of Jews among our citizenship. In the latest census, about 2,000,000 are reported; 143,000 families are connected with their 1,800 congregations.[1]

This people is growing both in numbers and in influence. They are loyal to the government, industrious and prosperous in business. Drunkenness is rare among them. Their zeal for their own religion is great. And more than all, they are included in our commission to preach to all men the riches of Christ. For these reasons a study of Paul's discussion will be enlightening.

It must be noted at the outset of the study that Paul was writing to those who knew the prophetic books well. And he knew them well. The question was not one of curiosity, but one of great im-

[1] According to the American Jewish Year Book just issued there are 1,500,000 Jews in New York City. This is nearly one-half the total number in this country, and makes New York the largest Jewish community ever gathered in a single municipality. Other figures for the city are 2,200 Jewish congregations; 180 religious schools with 41,403 pupils; more than 100 Jewish recreational and cultural agencies; more than 1,000 mutual aid societies; 965 lodges; 193 economic agencies, and 164 philanthropic and correctional agencies.

portance to them. We may therefore expect that he would put into his reply all that was vital, and inferentially what he left out has little importance.

Reading his discussion carefully, we note that there are several ideas that are made emphatic.

The word of God has not come to nought. From outward appearances one might be led to think it had. For it is plain that the great mass of the descendants of Abraham were not believers in Christ, nor even included in the Jewish church. There were the descendants of the ten tribes that made up the northern kingdom of Israel after the secession movement under Solomon's son. Then outside of them were the descendants of Esau. There must therefore be some line of demarcation between the inheritors of the promise to Abraham and those who were not his heirs, between those who were called children and those who were not. To lay a foundation for his argument he says, "They are not all Israel that are of Israel." That is, the name "Israel" belongs only to a part of the natural descendants of Israel. In another instance also the same statement is made, "Neither, because they are Abraham's seed, are they all children" (of God). It is only with a part of Abraham's descendants that the covenant was made. Only a part can claim any promise. If therefore the covenant does not fail with this selected portion it does not fail at all. The members of the other portion, whatever may be their status, are not involved in the

covenant that Paul is here discussing. It is this select portion that he calls the "true Israel," or the "children of God," or the "children of promise."

This selection was made by God himself. This he shows by citing the case of Isaac, of whom it was written, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." That is, not all of Isaac's descendants, but some out from among them. It was not at that time shown what part of his descendants would be thus honored.

Later in the history it is recorded that "before they were born, and before either had done good or evil," and therefore not by reason of any merit in him, it was said, "the elder shall serve the younger." That indicates the portion of the "seed" of Isaac that will be honored—the younger of these two sons of Isaac—that is, Jacob.

The same idea from another standpoint is set forth in a quotation from the record concerning Pharaoh: "For this very purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show in thee my power, and that my name might be published abroad in all the earth" (Rom. 9 : 17). And again the words to Moses, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion" (Rom. 9 : 15).

Thus Paul has made it plain that both the selection of the "seed" and the direction of things among the outside world are made by God alone.

This idea runs all through Paul's writings. In chapter eight he says: "Whom he foreknew, them

he foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. And whom he foreordained, them he also called; and whom he called he justified; and whom he justified he glorified." The whole process from creation to glorification is thus conceived of as animate with God's purpose as a tree is controlled by the purpose to bear fruit.

In Ephesians he has the same idea: "Having foreordained us unto adoption as sons, . . according to the good pleasure of his own will, . . having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he purposed in himself" (Eph. 1 : 5, 9).

If one were to sift out from Paul's life and writings all that is confessedly dependent on the idea that God was directing, there would not be enough left to be worth preserving.

Because some were disposed to make this superb faith in God an excuse for their sins did not deter him from speaking the truth about it. To him God was all in all. And unto him were all things.

God's will must be accepted as right. Some one would naturally raise the query whether it was fair in God to select for his favor a part of mankind and leave the others out. We all appreciate the force of such a query. Paul answers it by an appeal to their sense of the fitness of things. "Shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus? Has not the potter a

right over the clay, . . to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor?"

"Who art thou that repliest against God?" This reply does not at once meet the case of a man who makes the inquiry. It has the unwelcome flavor of an autocratic smothering of the question, as if to ask it were a sort of *lèse-majesté,* as the French would call it. No one of the hundreds of writers on this part of the chapter has failed to discuss the difficulty supposed to reside in the acceptance of the full sovereignty of God. This shows that there is a sort of necessity to discuss it. But Paul was not writing to unthoughtful people. He expected they would go deep into the case. Does not the mind of man of natural necessity fall back on the sovereignty of God as the solution of all things? Does not the very idea of God imply autocratic determination? Would any one be satisfied to think that there is no control, no plan, no sure "divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will"? Whatever Paul's mind might have seen in the case, he had such a high and worthy idea of God's grace that he was willing to trust in his autocratic control with comfort of mind, assured that only loving-kindness was back of it all. He would join with the poet Cowper in saying:

> Judge not the Lord by feeble sense,
> But trust him for his grace;
> Behind a frowning providence
> He hides a smiling face.

It seemed to him also that the Christian people who were the recipients of God's great grace were the ones most obligated to trust the sovereignty of God without cavil or mistrust.

With whom did he make the covenant? If all are not "Israel" that are the natural descendants of him, who are? If not all that have Abraham's blood in their veins are included in the select company, who are included? He says only the "children of promise." But what is meant by a "child of promise"? He means one who has his special blessings and his place in this select company by reason of a promise that God has made and fulfilled by introducing into the natural order of things his own supernatural help. In the case of Isaac, his mother was long past the age at which women bear children, but a child was promised and was born according to the promise. In the case of Jacob the natural order of men would have made the elder to rule, but in this case the elder is to serve the younger in accordance with a promise and the introduction of a special help later on.

It is such as these with whom the covenant is made. They are "Israel."

But now Paul begins to look for the larger meaning of the promise. He would define the matter more fully. What are the limits of this company of selects? In the larger sense "they that have faith like Abraham are children and heirs according to promise." "We, as Isaac was, are children

of promise" (Gal. 4 : 28), "which contains an allegory" about spiritual things. This broadening of the limits of the company, he says, was foretold by the prophet Hosea when he said, "I will call that my people, which was not my people; and her beloved, that was not beloved. And in the place where it was said, Ye are not my people, there shall they be called sons of the living God." Peter had the same idea when he said, in his address at Pentecost, "The promise is unto . . . even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

What about the men of real faith among the Jews not believers? There were then and are now many Jews of such sort as Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathæa; and many priests; and thousands of whom James said, "They are all believers, but are very zealous for the law"—such as are here said to be "zealous for God, but not according to knowledge." If these are the "remnant" of which the prophets spoke (Rom. 11 : 4), and are "children of God by faith," and hence in the covenant, why are they not believers? And if they are not, what is their status? He says, "Blindness in part has happened to them." They see the unity and holiness of God, but they do not see that Christ is the Messiah. As Paul verily thought he ought to oppose Christ until he saw the truth about him more fully, so these are failing to get the full benefit of their covenant with God because they are in part blind to it. The fault does not lie in their faith but in

their knowledge. They cling to the ceremonial, and to the national idea that Jerusalem must be the place for perfect worship of God. They are not yet open-eyed to the wider mercy of God that takes the Gentiles into the select company whenever they have faith.

They are not cast off. God is still their God. They have stumbled, but they have not fallen. Nay, their stumbling is a part of the divine plan for being merciful to others. What appears so mysterious will be found to have had a glorious termination.

The Epistle to the Galatians and the one to Hebrews were written to open the eyes of these faith-possessing but partly blinded "heirs of the promises" to the riches of their possessions. The apostle prays that the eyes of their understanding may be opened, that they may know the riches of their inheritance, the hope of their calling, and the power of God toward them. (Eph. 1 : 18-20.) The writer of Hebrews attempts to show them how the ceremonial law was only a shadow of good things to come, but that now the real thing is at hand. (Heb. 10 : 1.)

But this blindness is not permanent. For a time these people are cut off from the full blessings of God's covenant. When the fulness of the Gentiles has accepted Christ, then these will be led to see that Christ is after all the one whom God sent to be the Messiah, and will turn to him in great num-

bers. So, as it is written, "all Israel will be saved." They will be grafted again into the great olive tree of God's church, and though later in the history, will not be deprived of any part of the blessing.

Such then is Paul's reply to the question, What about the Jews? Summed up it is this: By the determinate counsel of God, a typical covenant was made with a select portion of Israel. This class was composed of those who were influenced and helped by the supernatural power of God; in the exercise of his own good pleasure he enlarged it to include all who in any time or place would in faith accept his help. A part of them have been slow in seeing the fulness of the blessing, but later will have their eyes open and then be welcomed to the kingdom.

Into what are they to come? This is an important question. When they are "grafted in again," what is to be their condition? They are to come into the same things that others came into. They differ in no particulars whatever from Gentile converts to Christ. In Ephesians the apostle writes, "God hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us," and all belong to the kingdom, nay, more, they are "members of the household of faith," built into the temple of God for his habitation. They were in sin "together"; they will be "quickened together," "raised up together," made to "sit together in heavenly places" (Eph. 2:

5, 6). "There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman, but Christ is all, and in all" (Col. 3 : 11). All believers come in at the same door of mercy. It leads to the same level of honor. It is not higher nor lower. "The same God who is rich toward all that call upon him" is God of both. "That with one accord ye may with one mouth glorify the God and Father of our Lord" (Rom. 15 : 6).

It is a noteworthy fact that every mature Christian individual passes psychologically through the very steps that are recorded in the history of Israel. First, a dim confused idea of God, then a sense of duty to be his obedient people, then a growing sense of the sinfulness which must put a veil over our faces, then a knowledge of his grace in providing a Messiah, and then the sense of being in full harmony with him and the object of his constant care and thought. As through all the history, mingled with many misconceptions, there runs a deep sense of God guiding in some way toward a better state of things, so in the individual life. It is to this latter consciousness that the Christian is to come. And to this the remnant are to come, for all of that faith-possessing Israel will be saved.

As a necessary inference, then, there is no call for the Christian Jew to go back to Jerusalem any more than for the Gentile. There is no room for the temple, for they that worship God worship

neither at Jerusalem nor Gerizim, but anywhere in spirit and in truth. (John 4 : 23.) There is no room for sacrifices, for Christ was the reality of which the sacrifices were the shadow. (Heb. 10 : 1.) There is no circumcision, for "neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature" (Gal. 6 : 15).

If there is any racial feeling that prompts Jews to go back to Jerusalem, it is their privilege to do so. If they can unite in the formation of a separate nation, it would doubtless be admitted into the family of nations. But all this would have no relation to the Christian faith. To endeavor to put the Christian future of a Christian Jew into the earthly conditions and the narrow bounds of Palestine is as futile as to try and put the luscious apple back into a blossom.

The writers of the New Testament all agree in presenting the teaching that the whole Jewish régime of both ceremonial and national character is done away in Christ. It is not to be dishonored, not "outgrown," but "grown out of." When the birdlings are soaring in the sky, why rebuild the nest in which they were hatched?

This brief survey gives us full sympathy with Paul when thinking of the matter he wrote: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out . . . To him be the glory for ever" (Rom. 11 : 33, 36).

CHAPTER XIV

THE CHRISTIAN LITURGY

In the Metropolitan Museum in New York City there is a rare collection of pottery, gold and silver jewelry, and precious stones. The jewelry shows the most delicate workmanship. The stones were cut by masters in the art. Thousands of dollars would not now buy the bare precious metal, while the value to the archeologist and the historian is inestimable. This wonderful collection was found in the island of Cyprus, in the Mediterranean, in the decade preceding the year 1876, by General Cesnola. It was found in the depths of vaults cut in the rock underneath a temple that was destroyed six hundred years before Paul was in Cyprus on his first missionary journey. (Acts 13 : 4.) These treasures were votive and thank-offerings made by devout worshipers in the temple. They bear a mute and touching testimony to the sense of gratitude those people felt for mercies they ascribed to their gods, and their desire to make some worthy expression of it.

This is a common trait in all races and ages. Among the Jews it was cultivated and provided for by a liturgy containing both sacrifices and thank-offerings.

The psalmist said: "What shall I render unto Jehovah for all his benefits toward me? I will take the cup of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord. I will pay my vows unto Jehovah. Yea in the presence of all his people" (Ps. 116 : 12-14). The people sang to one another: "Enter into his gates with thanksgiving and into his courts with praise" (Ps. 100 : 4); "Ascribe unto Jehovah the glory due unto his name: bring an offering, and come into his courts" (Ps. 96 : 8). Mary was moved to pour out the precious ointment upon the head of Jesus as her expression of her gratitude. (Matt. 26 : 6.) We notice in our day that the time when men are most ready to make generous contributions to charities and missions is after a great sense of spiritual awakening. This has been taken advantage of by covetous preachers who have left the regular pastorates because they expected to get great financial returns. The appropriate feeling is capitalized by unworthy men. But the abuse of it by some does not invalidate the right use of it. When a man realizes the mercy of God to him there springs up at once the desire to make some sort of return for it. As it is boorish for children to receive gifts and not say "Thank you," so it is in larger matters a kind of spiritual boorishness, a lack of religious courtesy, not to desire to say a great "Thank you" to the Giver of spiritual gifts. A clear view of any of God's attributes awakens response in the heart of a well-brought-up Chris-

tian. A sight of his holiness arrays us against sin. A sight of his wondrous works in earth and sky so impressed the Indian that it

> . . . bowed
> His spirit with the thought of boundless power
> And inaccessible majesty,

and led him

> In the darkling wood,
> Amid the cool and silence, to kneel down,
> And offer to the Mightiest solemn thanks
> And supplication.

The justice of God awakens the fires of righteousness in men. His mercy moves us to compassion. All feel the need of some suitable expression of gratitude. The Romans had reason to be perplexed over this matter. Paul had taught them that circumcision, which was a pledge to keep the whole law of the temple, was not important. They were taught that the death of Jesus was the reality of which the sin-offering was the shadow; and now that he had come the shadow was of no use. The city of Jerusalem was of no importance to the Christians at Rome. Paul might have a remnant of racial pride, and a sediment of his former reverence toward the holy place, but he did not teach others to esteem Jerusalem or its temple as important. They came to the sabbaths and to the Passovers with no part to take. They saw the offerings of others and

had none of their own. No doubt there was mental perplexity, and some heart-lonesomeness. "What are we to do? What is our liturgy? What do you give us in place of the other service we were glad to render?"

He begins this section of his letter with the words: "Present your bodies living sacrifices, holy and acceptable to God, which is your reasonable liturgy," or as the revision has it, your "spiritual service [1]."

Let us notice at the outset the exhortation in detail.

"*Present your bodies,*" that is, bring them, in thought, and turn them over to God. Settle it in your heart that your bodies are no more in your absolute possession than the offerings in the temple were in the possession of the offerer after he had presented them at the temple.

"*Your bodies,*" that is, all the powers of your bodies; the sum total of the faculties with which your bodies are endowed. It includes the power of hands. It contains the affections of the heart. It turns over the workings of your minds.

"*Living sacrifices.*" Here is the great idea of his exhortation. The sacrifices of the old ritual were to be dead ones. They were to be burned on the altar. They went up in smoke or were dissolved in the fragrance of incense. These sacrifices of ours

[1] The Greek word is *latreian;* see also Rom. 9 : 4; Heb. 9 : 1; where the word is translated "service."

are to be used in practical service of the Lord's kingdom. This is an important word in his teaching. It is very common to limit the meaning of the word sacrifice to only one part of its meaning. People seem to think that the mere act of going without is a sacrifice. In Syria there was a class of men who are called stylites. They stood up in public places for years, getting their food from those who thought it a great honor to minister to such holy devotees. Their error was that they thought "going without" was a sacrifice; that to waste energy by standing up for no good purpose was a service to God. This error is not wholly out of fashion now. Thus a woman gives up the God-given function of wifehood and motherhood, thinking to be holier than the common woman by living in a convent. Men give up the duty of citizens and fathers to retire into monasteries and live apart from the temptations of the world. In lesser degree women in the churches "give up" social functions, thinking it is a sort of holy action to "give up" something they like. Surely this is not the wish of God, it was not the thought of Paul, that bodily powers are to be dwarfed, mutilated, shriveled, and then brought to God as a sacrifice acceptable to him. Suppose a woman should come and say, "Lord, here is my voice, I have denied myself the pleasure of singing"; or a man should say: "Here is my body; for thy sake I have refused to cultivate my muscles; and I have stopped reading and think-

ing; I laid them all on the altar of religion." It is not irreverent to say that God would reply: "Yes, your talent for music you did not use for the comfort of men; you hid it in a napkin; your bodily strength entrusted to you for my service you abused and neglected until now you are a walking drug-store instead of a temple of the Holy Spirit; your mind, which was to be trained to see and know my glorious power in the universe, is shriveled and weak; now do you come and offer to me that faded, shelf-worn kind of remnant as a sacrifice?" These are not "living sacrifices"; they are only the husks with the ears lost out. No! this is not what is required of an intelligent and faithful disciple. He is to cultivate all his powers of body and mind thoughtfully; and put his powers, according to his best judgment, into the work that his Master has set all his people to do in this world, making his kingdom to come in all places.

"*Which is your reasonable liturgy.*" That is, in view of all that has been given us and done for us by our Lord and Master, the most rational way to serve him is not simply to sing praises—though that is a part of the service—but to enlist in the prosecution of his great work—not of "making the world safe for democracy," but—of making *democracy fit for the world,* and *making the world safe for democracy.* We are not able to do it all: we are only junior partners in the task; but our part is a necessary one, and our duty is to do it faithfully.

If this examination of Paul's thought makes any serious impression upon us we are prompted at once to ask: "How can we fulfil the exhortation? What in detail are the specific things that we can do?"

There are many lines in which our minds naturally run out in reply to this query; but we shall do well if we follow the lines that the apostle himself followed.

There is no very marked order in his treatment, but some lines of division are found. The twelfth chapter has two sections, one concerning the relation of the individual to the whole church, the other concerning Christian love. Then in the thirteenth chapter he speaks of the duties to the state.

In a general statement he says we are not to take the world or its fashions as our guide or model. But as our ideals of life are to be conformed to Christ's ideal, we are to let them and not the fashion of the world shape our outward conduct in a good and acceptable manner.

Then he speaks of our relation to the church. No paraphrase can add much to the beauty or forcefulness of this exhortation. The important basis of it is the idea that the individual is a part of the body of Christ. That is, no one is to think of his gifts as to be used for himself alone or his own glory. The individual is not to be isolated from the rest of the church. He is not to be a sort of bushwhacker, fighting according to his own notions, be they ever so brave, but to think of him-

self as one of many and to coordinate his work with theirs. This statement has in it the central principle of the best sociological spirit.

But some of its condensed statements will gain in force if we look carefully at them.

"Be not more high-minded than you ought to be minded," is a fair translation. That is not by any means an exhortation to think little of one's self. No man has a right to underestimate his own value in the community, and in his church. Every man has a value to all the others. But let him think it out soberly and according as God has given him faith. "If our work is to preach, then our preaching must correspond to our faith; if it is to minister to others, then we must devote ourselves to our work. The teacher must devote himself to his teaching; the speaker to his exhortation. Those who distribute charity must distribute with generous hearts; those who do acts of kindness must do them in a cheerful spirit." [2]

In a school for teachers in New York State one of the teachers was receiving a kind criticism of her work, and she was exhorted to "put more joy into it." This is what Paul meant by "doing with cheerfulness." It is not an infrequent thing to hear even ministers say, "I've got to preach next Sunday," as though it was an irksome task. The man who has not joy in preaching is only fifty per cent efficient. The man who doles out the "poor fund"

[2] Twentieth Century New Testament.

of the church as if he was sorry to part with it, is not doing his work as he ought. It ought to be true that, while the church is sorry that any one needs financial help, there is such a great tone of gladness that the church is able to minister to the need that it sweetens the bitter waters of mortification on the part of those who receive the help.

"Diligent in business"; so the common version reads. But that is as inaccurate a rendering as one can make; for the original has no reference to "business" as we use the word. The Revised makes it read, "in diligence not slothful." Better than either of these is, "When earnestness is called for, be not slow to supply it." It is said of John Adams' wife that at one time when he was going away on some public business, she said to him, "John, do not shilly-shally." That is a fair representation of Paul's thought. Do not shilly-shally in any thing that it is duty to do. Jesus put it in good phrase when he said that the great commandment is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind" (Matt. 22 : 37).

"Take thought for things honorable in the sight of all men." The Christian life is not an unearthly one. It is founded on the deepest experiences and instincts of men. To go contrary to the universal moral ideas of mankind is surely to go against the Christian morality. Christian morality is never contradictory to natural morality, but in many things

carries natural morality to its best development, and then goes beyond. But the great power of Christian ethics is in the new motives and the enlistment of the affections for the help of the intelligence in doing the right.

The "man of God" is a constant quantity for many centuries back. Whatever may be the age of the Old Testament writings, the ideal man has not changed much since the Scriptures were written.

The thirty-first chapter of Job does not need apology in the light of the New Testament. And even in the Jewish extra-biblical writings the ideal does not fall below. For example, in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs we read: "Keep, my children, the law of God . . . not playing the busybody with the business of thy neighbor. But love the Lord and your neighbor. Have compassion on the poor and weak . . . offering gifts to the Lord with thanksgiving." And again, about forgiveness it was written, "If a man be shameless and persisteth in his wrong-doing, even so forgive him from the heart and leave to God the avenging."

"The precepts of the peoples before Moses' time," said Dr. Howard Osgood, "would go far toward making a reverent, clean-minded, gently spoken, diligent, discreet, respectful, independent, straightforward man; far from pride of place or of knowledge, as well as from the viler forms of life. He would be supremely careful of his home, his wife, and children, to guard them from foes within

and without, that they might live soberly and truthfully, with an eye upon that day when they must lie in the valley."

"*Avenge not yourselves. . . Vengeance is mine; I will recompense, saith the Lord.*" This needs especial thought just now when the natural sense of injury and the natural resentment are roused against almost every form of cruelty and dishonor as practised by the Germans against nearly all the world. Just what is the duty of the Christian people to demand of the government concerning the leaders of the barbarities it is not easy to say. But we need not be careful about saying that we may not do anything for vengeance. We may need to do some severe things as a preventive or as an exhibition of public abhorrence of such things as have been perpetrated by the leaders, but we need to suppress and pray against the spirit of vengeance. That belongs to God, and he will not fail in justice.

Such then are the outlines of the kind of life that Paul thought becomes those who are justified by faith through the grace of God. It has been written of Lieutenant Farré, a noted artist in France, who enlisted in the aviation service, that he invented a system of recording as he flew the colors and scenes about and below him; and then after he went to earth again he painted from these suggestions a noted set of pictures.[3]

[3] See "Ladies' Home Journal," Sept., 1918.

These "notes" of Paul, sailing in the higher realms, if taken as sketches only and filled out in daily life, will give us the most perfect men and women the earth knows. Let each one of these short exhortations of this chapter alone be filled out in a natural and logical way, and we shall have the ideal human life. Its beauty has never been discredited. Its usefulness has not been denied. It was said by Mr. Herbert Spencer that probably a "rationalized version of the Christian creed" would at the end of the evolutionary process be finally adopted. And when this process is finished it will be found that all its essential features were here given to the world.

CHAPTER XV

THE CHRISTIAN AND THE STATE

"Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers."—Rom. 13 : 1.

This subject, always important, has had an extra interest owing to the world war that has been in progress and the demands made on the citizens for money and for men to carry it on. Many people were much perplexed concerning their duty. We have been taught, and we have approved the teaching, that war is sinful. We have been in hearty agreement with General Sherman's statement that "war is hell." We say it with no taint or tint of irreverence. "War is hell." For hell in the last analysis is simply the ripened fruit of somebody's wrong-doing. As we get first-fruits of the heavenly harvest in the happiness that comes to us when we do right, so we get an earnest of the ultimate hell in the preliminary results of wrong-doing.

It may be the wrong-doing of a state in which we are so interwoven that we share in the suffering without individual choice of wrong-doing. The Civil War in our country in 1861 was the result of the wrong-doing of the States in permitting slavery to exist as it had. Or, it may be the wrong-doing of

a little coterie of mortals called the "royal family" whose ambitions lead them to make war for mere selfish satisfaction. In 1913 Baroness Sutten of Austria was in this country speaking in behalf of international peace. In one of her addresses at Drexel Institute, she said: "Why do they say of Austria or Germany that 'she' has declared war? The 'shes' have nothing to do with it. War comes from a few lords and dukes and the Krupp family." In such cases the common people have little to do but suffer the evils of war, not its guilt. Nevertheless these few and the Krupp family brought on a war, and the war is the hell into which their wrongdoing has crystallized.

This war came from the shameless violation of solemn treaty agreements; from the infamous conduct of German soldiers who in Belgium abused women, slaughtered babies, and pillaged homes; from the impudent forbidding of our ships to sail the seas that are the property of all; from the unparalleled crime of sinking hundreds of noncombatants in the Lusitania; and the threats to come here and enforce hypocritical cant about ruling by "divine right." These were the causes of this war. Whether America was right or wrong in doing so, the people of America—including the "shes"—were very unanimous in deciding that we ought to go to the rescue of the weak and the defense of ourselves.

In spite of the impulse to go, we in some quiet

moments, as we read the reports of losses and were made to feel the cost in many ways, have reviewed the case and asked: "Were we right in entering the war? Have we any Christian principle that warrants it? Are we showing lack of faith in the teachings of Jesus that when one smites us on one cheek we should turn the other also? Or that we should love our enemies and do good to them that despitefully use us? Or the teaching of Paul himself in this same letter, 'Overcome evil with good'?"

Jesus is called the Prince of Peace. How can his ministers, standing in Christian pulpits, on the Christian Sabbath, with the Christian book in their hands, encourage Christian people to go and help kill the enemies? or even support with prayers and money those who do?

Those who ask these questions are not pro-German; nor are they lacking in what is called patriotism, or courage. Their question is whether there is a law superior to the law of the state and of society, and if so does it forbid them to war?

We may not expect Paul to answer all the questions we of this day may desire to ask of him. He was writing to Romans in the time of the Cæsars. He did not attempt to say what are the ethics of war; nor what are the duties of Christian citizens if a foreign people invades their country with hostile intent; nor what we ought to say about standing armies and large navies; nor what is the duty

of the Christian citizen about enlistment in time of war. Of these and other questions growing out of our intricate and complex civilization he said nothing directly. If one is looking for a " Thus saith the Lord " on this matter, he will find but little if any satisfaction.

But while this is true, a closer look at his writings discovers evidence that in his mind were certain ideas which, allowed to have their full force, would go far toward giving a reply to our modern questionings.

There were in his time three leading opinions about the relation of Christians to the state; and to all of them Paul was addressing his word in this section.

One class held that civil governments were under the direction of demons. This world belongs to Satan, and the Christians have no business meddling with its government. They are aliens living in a foreign country for a while. They have no more to do with the governments than an American has when he lives for a time in Turkey or China. They quote Peter as saying, " I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims."

Another class regarded the Roman government as an unholy usurpation of power; and they felt no moral obligation to do more than to submit until an opportunity arose to throw off the yoke that so grievously galled them. They were the ones who asked Jesus if it was lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar.

A third class, to which probably Paul might be said to belong, thought the time of the Saviour's return was near at hand. He wrote, "The night is far spent, the day is at hand" (Rom. 13 : 12). "The time is shortened, that henceforth those that have wives be as though they had none, and those that weep as though they wept not" (1 Cor. 7 : 29, 30). "Establish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord is at hand" (James 5 : 8). If such was their expectation, the character of the government was of little account. The main thing was to be safe while they remained. So Paul wrote to Timothy: "I exhort therefore, that . . . supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings, be made for . . . kings and all that are in high place; that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity" (1 Tim. 2 : 1, 2).

Add to these differing views of the state the fact that the state itself—which meant the aristocrats of power—regarded the Christians with a degree of suspicion lest they were a group of malcontents disposed to deny the authority of the emperor.

In the presence then of such elements, Paul wrote, "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers." And then he goes on to give his reasons. These reasons are of perpetual validity.

First, "*the powers that be*"—that is, civil governments—"*are ordained of God.*" Not that God had specially organized the Roman government, but the Creator wrought the need for civil government into

the very constitution of society. As this is the great major premise of Paul's thought, it will make his teaching clear if we consider the statement he makes. Every nation must have some form of government to give it either unity or safety. A nation is a group of people so organized that some one or more of its citizens represent it and speak for it. Whether it be for mutual welfare or for safety from enemies, there must be those whose business it is to speak for the nation, and to direct its affairs, and provide for its continuance. We see the value of government if we suppose all government to be taken away. Then we have anarchy—that is, no archon. Russia is an example of what happens when there is no ruling body. Every man takes upon himself the task of avenging his injuries, of collecting his dues, of defending by force his home. Even the anarchists at the outset deny their creed by electing a Lenine or a Trotsky to lead them in their fight for anarchy. The Jews well knew the results of such a condition, for their books told them of a time when there were no judges in Israel, but every man did what was right in his own sight. (Judg. 21 : 25.)

Every community in every age has been obliged to frame some sort of government. Three families cannot live together without something in the nature of a government. Superior wisdom or strength always puts some one at the head of the others and gives him the duty to speak and act for the others.

It is for this reason we say God ordains the "powers that be."

When a nation becomes large, and occupies a great territory, the necessity for government becomes all the more imperative.

And with the increasing numbers the demands on the government become more numerous and complex. In our own enlarging country, how many things are now demanded from the government that formerly were not considered any part of its responsibility.

There are common roads to be laid out, built, and maintained. There are schools to support and direct. There are legislatures to elect and support. Charitable institutions are to be supported. There are franchises to be regulated, sewers and water systems to provide for, health measures of a public character to inaugurate. Then the rights of the public for railroads and commerce are to be defined and maintained. In addition to these honorable and laudable tasks there is the necessary one of restraining crime and policing the land. One has only to think of these things to see that a strong and wise government is a necessity for the comfort and safety of the people. It is ordained by the One who created us as we are. We cannot overestimate the value of such a provision.

But this implies that the government must be supported by the people. Whether it is as creditable as it ought to be or not, the "power that is"

must be sustained. It is always better than no "power." It is a principle of law that a right to be implies a right to defend being. A government that has a right to be has the right to support and defend itself. There must be taxes to pay the men who do the special work the government needs to have done. There must be the recognition of the authority of the officials in the realm of their duties. There must be places of business where people can find the men they seek to speak the governmental word of counsel.

Thus far men will not differ. But the inference must go further. The right to be implies the right to defend itself against enemies within or without. However much we may shrink from it, no nation that has a right to be can be denied the right to defend itself with force of arms if need be. No one who lives in the protection of the police can dispute the right of the police to use force in protecting citizens from abuse or robbery. It needs but an increase of danger to justify the increase in the police force.

If the danger comes from outside—that is, if another nation seeks to damage or destroy or subjugate it—then the police force becomes an army, and war ensues. There seems to be no doubt that the inference is necessary from the admitted divine ordination of government. In that sense God ordains war. In that sense it is not against Christian principles to engage in war for self-defense.

"Wherefore we must needs be in subjection" to government, not only for fear of its punishments, but "for conscience sake."

Another inference is necessary:

"*For this cause pay tribute also.*" That is, the Christian should assume the share of the cost of the government that is assessed upon him by the "powers that be"—that is, by the official persons who have charge of such matters.

It is not his privilege to refuse because he does not like the tax, nor because he thinks it unnecessary. It is levied by the appointed officers and their demand is the demand of the whole government. Probably few will seriously question the duty to pay that kind of tribute.

There is another tribute as justly due as taxes, that is, obedience to such regulations of life and food as the governing authorities require. Conservation in certain foods has been asked for. Restrictions have been put upon the use of sugar, wheat, meats, and fats, in order that the armies and navies of the country and the Allies (and these for the time being are as our own armies) may be well supplied. Autoists are required to save gasoline because it is needed at the front. Railroad travel has been limited in several ways because the military necessities have been so great. Coal, which is diverted in greatly increased quantities to manufacturing and to naval use, must be used in sparing measure. All these are parts of the tribute that

every citizen owes to the government. The Christian man is under obligation to be the obedient loyal citizen.

But another tribute is as surely due as taxes. When war is declared it is the duty of the citizen to assume the share of danger and perhaps death that the government costs. One can no more deny the right of the government to call men to the army than he can deny the right to ask him for taxes. In America we have so long been free from war, and what little we had made so light a demand upon us, that we have not realized what our excellent government with all its privileges and safety costs. Of late it has all come in a bunch. Millions of men and billions of money are necessary. Much as we shrink from brutalizing ourselves to meet the brutality that is arrayed against us, it is a part of the cost of our liberties. And we can find no argument to sustain our refusal to meet the demand upon us, because the "powers that be" are ordained of God and because we claim to be obedient in special measure to the ordinance of God.

It follows that one who begrudges these tributes, or who seeks to avoid his share of the burden, is not only piggish and disloyal, but irreligious as well.

There are two objections to the conclusion that have great weight. One is that the law of God is superior to any obligations of the state. It is pointed out that the apostles in the first days of the Church were commanded by the State not to

preach the Christian facts—the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus. But they refused obedience, saying they could not but speak the things they had seen and heard. Martyrs in several ages have died rather than submit to the dictates of the state. And we are accustomed to laud the devotion and faith of the martyrs.

That there is some force in this is true. But it is to be noted that these martyrs did not refuse any obedience to the state that was within the province of the state, nor did they do anything which lessened the welfare and authority of the state as a civil power. As a matter of fact, the Christian people have been in all ages just what Paul taught that they should be, "in subjection to the powers that be" in all civil matters.

And the reply may also be made that the law of God on these matters is not explicit. Admitting that the law of God is above the state, how are we to know what the law of God in this matter is except by legitimate inferences from the fact that governments are ordained by him? Legitimate inference from a principle becomes an explicit law.

The other objection is made by those who say that the law "Thou shalt not kill" supersedes all other laws both by its wording and by the dignity with which it is accompanied. If people do in their hearts believe this and are not using it as a cover for their hesitancy to go into the army, we say the burden of showing that the law against killing does

supersede the one that says "render to the government its dues" is on them. "To God the things that are God's and to the government the things that belong to government" remains in force.

If such people would be consistent, they should refuse to accept any of the protections that organized government gives in which force is used and behind which the sword of punishment is found to be in operation.

So, unpleasant as the task is, loyal service in the armies and navies of the nation in defense of themselves or others is not against the Christian teaching but rather by the strongest inference is required. For the existence and authority of such are divinely ordained.

CHAPTER XVI

THE REQUIREMENTS OF CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP

THIS section of the letter deals with a very long-lived tendency, and a perpetual duty. It discusses the "terms of membership" in the Christian churches. It seeks to instruct concerning who should come in to them and what is due to them after they do come in. It was suited to certain conditions in Rome; but it states the principles regulating the matter in so broad a way that we find them suited or suitable to our day and circumstances.

The church at Rome as we have seen was composed of those who had come from the Jewish church, and those who had come from the idolatrous part of the community. That is, some of the people had been brought up in the strongest Jewish faith. All their lives they had been accustomed to observe special days of religious observance, and to abstain from certain foods that others used freely. We recall how fault was found with Jesus because he healed on the Sabbath day. To the Jewish leaders that was an open insult to Jehovah, for around that day most of the ceremonies of religion clustered. To ignore that was to strike at the whole system. We recall also how Peter is represented as saying to the Lord, when on the housetop at

Joppa he was bidden to eat from the conglomerate collection of animals in the sheet let down from heaven, "Lord, I have never eaten anything common or unclean."

On the other hand, there were people who never had known anything about these days or these restrictions in food. They had been accustomed to days, but they were feasts, not fasts. They ate all the more liberally on those days.

These two so very diverse classes were to live together in the church. It would be impossible for them to do it and not find many occasions for mutual faultfinding. The Jewish portion would think that the Christian faith was only the finished house built on the Jewish foundation. They would insist that the foundation should not be disturbed. The others would insist that, as they had received all the spiritual blessings without ever having gone to Jerusalem, or having paid any attention to the ceremonies their brethren thought so much of, such ceremonies could not be of much importance. They would refuse to take on any such burden for themselves.

At the center it was a conflict between the tendency to lean upon ceremonies, and the opposite tendency to do without any. And along with these there was the disposition of some to think the others were not as good as themselves, and an insistence that all should think as they did about these matters.

There is plenty of similar conditions now. For

example, in the matter of admission into the church of Christ, some insist that one must assent to certain theological statements; others, that all must have a certain ceremony called baptism; others, that they must "tell an experience"; and if these requirements are not met to the satisfaction of the minister and two or three older members they are not to be received.

So about the Lord's Supper. Some admit only those who have been to confession and received absolution from the priest; others admit only those who have been confirmed by the bishop. In some churches members must go to the minister the day before and get a "token" from him which admits them to the Supper. Some give the invitation, "All ye who do truly and earnestly repent of your sins and are in love and charity with your neighbors . . . draw near in faith and take this holy sacrament with comfort." And still others say, "All who are members in good standing in sister churches of like faith and order are invited to remain to the Lord's Supper." In all these various forms and regulations there is the same spirit that troubled the Roman church: namely, the tendency to refuse full fellowship to those who are not in agreement on minor points of doctrine or practice although they are sincere believers in Christ Jesus as Lord and Saviour.

A similar difference exists in the ideas of conduct. In India for example, where the converts

have come from great degradation of religious teaching, it is impossible for them to have a high standard of ethics. The missionaries are obliged to admit on a level much lower than we in this country think is admissible. One missionary told me that he insisted on two things, namely, they must observe the Sabbath and attend the services, and the other, they must not attend feasts to idols. This accomplishes an open separation from heathenism and secures the continuous instruction in Christian truth. With these secured, the higher grade of living is attainable. In this country we have those who come from circles where the use of wine is common; others with whom the use of beer is as common and as innocently indulged in as are tea and coffee with us. This latter is especially true among the German people. It raises a question with many whether these with a much lower standard of life should be admitted to the church.

It seems to me that Paul's words exactly fit the case: "*Him that is weak in faith receive ye.*"

This becomes possible and practicable when it is remembered that the great objective of the gospel is to have men accept Christ. Once they put themselves into submission to him, he will work in them the changes needed to lift their lives to the Christian level. Men are transformed by the renewing of their minds. They grow in grace from children unto maturity. Until men have faith in Christ they cannot receive the help needed; but when they ac-

cept him all the forces of truth and of association and of hope unite to make them what they should be. If they have faith, all the rest is in process of attainment. If a man's God is Christ, then "to his own Lord he standeth or falleth." "And he shall be made to stand, for his Lord hath power to make him stand." "So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God." So we say, "Credible evidence of faith in Christ is the only, but vital prerequisite for membership in the church." [1]

It is worthy of notice that recently there has emerged from the depths of the religious sentiment of the country a very marked sympathy with this teaching of Paul. Not long since a very prominent Baptist layman [2] sent forth an address on "The Future of the Christian Church." Passing by the, as I think, too extreme views both of the so-called inefficiency of the churches and the force of what he calls the Religion of the Inarticulate, I notice that he sees very clearly the truth that Paul here utters: that the church should welcome all who have faith. His words, from some of which I dissent, are:

> It should be called the Church of the living God.
>
> Its terms of admission would be love for God, as he is revealed in Christ and his living spirit, and the vital translation of this love into a Christlike life. . .
>
> It would pronounce ordinance, ritual, creed, all non-essential for admission into the kingdom of God or his Church. . .

[1] Mathews, "Social Gospel," chap. I. [2] John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

> Its object would be to promote applied religion, not theoretical religion. . . It would encourage religion seven days in a week rather than speculation about the hereafter.

This note is often found in the pulpit as well as the pew. It comes from the unconscious logic of the heart in those who have found Christ a helper and friend. Freely they have received and freely they desire to give the message.

But the apostle does not stop with this much of instruction. He goes on to speak of what is required of us as well as of those asking admission.

"*Let us not therefore judge one another any more.*" This echoes the word of Jesus himself, "Judge not that ye be not judged." I take it that he means, "Do not assume the attitude of a judge of the people." It is not our task to separate the sheep from the goats. This cannot mean that we are not to pass judgment on conduct. We could not call one thing any better than another without passing judgment on the poorer kind. To say that such and such actions are unchristian is very different from saying that such a man is not a Christian. All Christians in the state of their earthly imperfection do things that are unchristian. It is not uncommon to hear ministers say from the pulpit that the man that does so and so is not a Christian. Such statements violate the apostolic word and the Saviour's own command.

One may point out the error in the conduct, and seek by various ways to make it appear, as it is, out

of harmony with the Christian ideal; but to pass judgment on the person neither does him good nor fulfils the instruction given us.

But the apostle goes further still. Not only are we to teach the brother the right way and to refrain from judging him, but we are to refrain ourselves from doing things that are right for us if they do harm to him.

Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died. I may have such a faith, and so intelligent a judgment about things material and ceremonial that were I alone in the world, or even among those who were like myself free from ceremonialism, I could do them without sin; but if I by my conduct encourage another to do what he thinks is wrong I become a wrong-doer, because I do damage to my brother. For example, one might think it entirely without harm for him to drive his auto for a rest and recreation on the Sabbath. But others have such an idea of the Sabbath that it appears to them wrong to have any sort of pleasure-rides. While they have that idea, it is sin for them to go on pleasure-rides. It is evil for that man who does it with a sense of doing wrong. Sin really consists in having a disobedient attitude toward God. Even when the judgment is in error so that things right appear to be wrong, they become sin to him, for he goes against his idea of right. If therefore our doings break down his spirit of obedience to what he thinks is right, or if our act makes it easier for him

to disobey, then we are doing him an almost irreparable injury; for the safety of any man lies in his loyalty to his own best convictions of duty. The man who is easy to persuade against his sense of right is always in mortal danger of becoming a dupe and then a slave to sin. (James 1 : 15.)

This has especial application in the matter of "temperance." It is perfectly certain that many people use wine at meals without the least discernible damage to themselves. It is certain that Jesus was not a teetotaler. At that time the issue was not raised. It is equally certain that if Jesus were here now he would be among the teetotalers. He would see that the influence of rum is so almost universally evil that he would, because of his interest in mankind, take his place among those who would not "for meat's" sake destroy one of those for whom he would give his life. This is only the same spirit that Paul speaks of when he says Christ made himself of no reputation and suffered death on the cross for mankind. (Phil. 2.)

There is, however, a subtle question in this connection. Suppose, for example, that a man uses wine, and never has any approach to intemperance. He has no scruples about it in his conscience, and thinks it is a weakness in others that they take such strict views of it as to think it sinful. He thinks they have a sort of holy superstition. He sincerely desires to have them rid of it. If he yields to their weakness, does he really help to disabuse

them of the error as much as he would to openly oppose it and show by his own case its error? In other words, is the best way to make men strong against an error to join them in it or to oppose it firmly? That was the argument put to me once by a wealthy woman at her own dinner-table because I declined to take the wine that was served. I found the effective reply was to ask her what she would think of me if her son was weak in that line and she was fearful about him, were I to come there and drink wine with him. "Oh," she replied, "that would be different." Yes, different; but in what way different? In this—she loved her son, she did not love the men on the street. To deny herself for her son's sake would be easy because she loved him, to do it for others' sake was not easy because she did not love them. After all, it is the love we have for our fellow men that decides these cases of casuistry for us. *"Let us follow after things whereby we may edify one another." "It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor to do anything whereby thy brother stumbleth."*

Then Paul goes on to another truth full of serious implications. *"The faith which thou hast have to thyself before God."*

But, he adds, *"Happy is the man that does not condemn himself in what he approves."* That is, while a man may do things with a clear conscience, it may be that his judgment is in error and that he ought to have a conscience against them. Happy

is the man whose decisions show that he has an enlightened judgment as well as a clear conscience. Here the apostle shows how clear his ethical ideas were. Conscience is not with him a "discerning faculty"; it is steam in the boiler, not wisdom in the pilot; it pushes, but it does not steer; it says "Do right," but it waits on judgment to know what right is.

So then, we are to admit all who have faith in Christ, and then with mutual forbearance and unfailing love seek to edify one another.

In this way we shall have real fellowship—that is, real partnership in this Christian business of making Christ's kingdom come among men.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: June 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 225 164 4